12-2017

Irish Harps, Scottish Fiddles, English Pens: Romantic Satire and British Nationalism

Shannon Raelene Heath
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, sheath2@vols.utk.edu

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Shannon Raelene Heath entitled "Irish Harps, Scottish Fiddles, English Pens: Romantic Satire and British Nationalism." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in English.

Nancy Henry, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Gerard Cohen-Vrignaud, Misty G. Anderson, Mary McAlpin

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Irish Harps, Scottish Fiddles, English Pens: Romantic Satire and British Nationalism

A Dissertation Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Shannon Raelene Heath

December 2017

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my grandfather, Dorsa Mitchem, who taught me that a job worth doing is worth doing well, and to my grandmother, Savannah Mitchem, who gave me my sense of humor and always swore I had a doctor's signature, although I think she meant M.D., not PhD.

Acknowledgements

"It is good to love many things, for therein lies the true strength, and whosoever loves much performs much, and can accomplish much, and what is done in love is well done." – Vincent van Gogh

Over the course of many years of study, there are a great many people to thank for their never-ending support and love. Starting with my family, I'd like to thank my mother, Judy, and sister, Whitney, for listening to me ramble out ideas and for the encouragement to keep going. I'd also like to thank Melanie and Julian Reece for their constant, loving support of numerous graduate students, for giving us a welcome gathering place and family for those of us who live far from our own. And to Fr. Rich Andre for his support and guidance, both spiritual and academic.

To former teachers and colleagues who have continued their support from afar: Dr. John Baker, Dr. Lisa Leslie, Drs. Peter and Kaye Graham, Dr. David Radcliffe, and Dr. Malcolm Kelsall.

A special thanks to my emotional support committee, John Walker, Matt, and Steve, and my "Blue Label" friends: Teresa, David, Maggie, Janelle, Traci, Eliza, Sam, and Leanne, for being there through all the frustrations of the past few years.

I'd also like to thank my committee for their patience, support, and guidance throughout the completion of the project.

And a belated thank you to Dr. Paul Kane, teacher, mentor, colleague, and friend, who encouraged me to apply for the PhD when I was in doubt. You are missed.

Abstract

"Irish Harps, Scottish Fiddles, English Pens: Romantic Satire and British Nationalism" discusses the intersection between satire and nationalism in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century British Romantic poetry. Using case studies of three prominent satirists, Robert Burns, Thomas Moore, and George Gordon, Lord Byron to represent marginalized nationalities within the British state, I examine the ways in which each poet expresses a sense of dis-ease or uncomfortableness with their own national identity, an anxiety caused either by the ways in which their nationality was perceived within the British public, or by their own ability or inability to express that nationality. Thus, Burns, Moore, and Byron use satire as a means to self-identify and/or promote a sense of national identity.

While the lyrics of Burns and Moore have been studied as examples of nationalist poetry, little attention has been given to their satires or to Byron's *Hours of Idleness* and *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* as expressions of nationalism and national identity. Satire becomes a fitting genre for expressing the anxieties and frustration surrounding their identities, particularly as these negative emotions are directed toward the structures of power – political, cultural, and theological – that reinforce the perceived supremacy of English culture at the cost of the Scottish and Irish nations. The expressions of these identities are complicated by several variables, including education, social status, socio-economic status, and nationality itself. I argue that through the melding of satire and nationalism, ultimately, the figure of the bard, a traditional record-keeper of national culture and history, merged with the persona of the satirist to become an active, nation-shaping force rather than a passive observer.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> "Poets, much my superiors, have so flattered those who possessed the adventitious qualities of wealth and power that I am determined to flatter no created being, either in prose or verse, so help me God. I set as little by kings, lords, clergy, critics &c as all these respectable Gentry do by my Bardship. I know what I may expect from the world, by and by, illiberal abuse and contemptuous neglect." (Robert Burns)[1]

> "Born of Catholic parents, I had come into the world with the slave's yoke around my neck…I was myself among the first of the young Helots of the land, who hastened to avail themselves of the new privilege of being educated in their country's university – though still excluded from all share in those college honors and emoluments by which the ambition of the youths of the ascendant class was stimulated and rewarded." (Thomas Moore)[2]

> "I passed my boyhood at Mar Lodge, near Aberdeen, occasionally visiting the Highlands; and I long retained an affection for Scotland; -- that, I suppose, I imbibed from my mother. My love for it, however, was at one time much shaken by the critique in the 'Edinburgh Review' on 'The Hours of Idleness,' and I transferred a portion of my dislike to the country; but my affection for it soon flowed back into its old channel." (Lord Byron)[3]

The three poets, Robert Burns (1759-1796), Thomas Moore (1779-1852), and George Gordon, Lord Byron (1788-1824), are each considered either a national poet or a representative poet of their "nation"; yet this word, "nation," hovers troublingly over discussions of their work. To what "nation" are we referring? All three are or should be considered British, as the place and time of their births fall within the borders of Great Britain during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Yet each poet to some degree also claims a unique cultural and social heritage as part of a distinct nationality, one molded both independent of and prior to the creation of Great Britain, but subsumed under the political banner of Britishness linking the nations of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales to a centralized government located in London. Here, I refer

[1] Robert Burns, qtd in *The Canongate Burns*, p60
[2] Thomas Moore, *Preface*. P19.
[3] Lord Byron, Medwin's *Conversations*, p57.

not to the political construct of the nation, but to the separate and individual populations that these poets claimed as home, populations characterized and united by the framework of common cultural, historical, religious, and linguistic attributes. However, as the quotations selected above demonstrate, these three poets also shared a common feeling of dis-ease or uncomfortableness with their national identity, either in the ways in which their individual nations were perceived and received by others within the larger framework of the British empire, or in their own ability to identify with and express that nationality. While all three poets voice these discomforts to a limited degree within their lyric poetry, these authors turn toward satire to express the most significant instances of national anxiety, as the nature of satire is most fitting for articulating feelings of anger, frustration, and criticism. Such difficulties of national identification and expression come to the forefront within the genre of satire, where this sense of dis-ease is targeted at various structures of power that, to the respective authors, represent the antagonistic forces harming their corresponding nations and national identity.

In this dissertation, I will examine the ways in which these three poets, Burns, Moore, and Byron, use satire as a tool to define national identity in relation to the larger political construct of Great Britain, and in opposition to the perceived supremacy of Englishness. These authors provide representative examples of the key nationalities at play: Scottish, Irish, and English, in order; thus, my argument takes the form of a series of case studies, examining the ways in which each author demonstrates their own sense of identity within their specific context. Their individual reactions are affected by such variables as personal history, national history (including recent events as seen in the case of Thomas Moore and the United Irishmen Uprising), socio-economic status, religion, and education. For Burns, satire becomes something of a tool, like a scalpel, excising what he feels are the unwanted and dangerous elements of modern Scottish society, exemplified by Auld Licht

Calvinism and the effects of Anglicization, in order to create a sense of Scottishness that is both true to Scotland's culture and acceptable within a wider civilized society. For Moore, satire becomes a key to unlocking forbidden accomplishments as he attacks lingering cultural and political anti-Irish and anti-Catholic attitudes and legislation to gain acceptance within the wider sphere of Great Britain. For Byron, however, national identity is more complex, as a cutting review of his poetic collection, *Hours of Idleness*, uncovers his own insecurities and uncertainties regarding dual nationality and identity, appearing to corner him into a false dichotomy in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* (*EBSR*). Byron's response then, is to seemingly reject Scottishness in favor of an ill-formed concept of English identity based on masculine codes of conduct associated with the aristocracy. In short, Burns rejects the structures of power he sees as harming identity (the Scottish Kirk and the English government); Moore seeks to join or gain acceptance among those structures (English government and polite society); and Byron affirms and upholds those structures and their exclusionary capabilities (English literary and aristocratic social dominance).[4] Together, these case studies give insight into the ways in which late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century authors from these marginalized British populations attempted to navigate the cultural and nationalist intricacies of the literary marketplace.

The primary methodology of this study will involve close reading with attention to the sociohistorical contexts surrounding individual publications. While discussion will rely on basic knowledge of the genre and development of Romantic satiric practice, consideration also will be

[4] The argument regarding Byron's view of national identity is specific to that which is presented in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*. As Chapter 3 will ultimately demonstrate, this construct is, at its heart, ill-conceived and short-lived, eventually giving way to an experienced sense of cosmopolitanism. As others have argued, Byron's sense of Scottish identity resurfaces periodically throughout his career, although in a muted, indirectly referential form, until finally emerging directly in its more mature sense in the "Auld Lang Syne" stanzas of Canto X of *Don Juan*.

given to the development of nationalism during the period in question, an area most notably discussed by such scholars as Katie Trumpener, Murray Pittock, Juliet Shields, Duff and Jones, and Davis et al. While these authors in general focus on the relationship between the various cultural, intellectual, and geographical areas that comprise "British" identity, Trumpener's examination of nationalism and the Romantic novel provides a particularly valuable observation. She argues that the problematic relations between the English government and its Scottish, Irish, and Welsh territories are revealed in the use of native traditions, specifically those which emphasize the figure of the *bard* as a herald of nationalism and cultural heritage within a troubled British state in contrast to British efforts to overlook or downplay native cultural practices. Examinations of the poetry of Burns, Moore, and Byron reveal that in Romantic satire, the figure of the bard becomes synonymous with the persona of the satirist, as the satirist seeks to variously correct and preserve paradigms of national identity. The bard is no longer a passive observer or historical recorder, but instead an active shaper of culture.

Satire, Nationalism, and the Scottish Enlightenment

Satire is, at its most basic, the use of humor as a means of correcting behavior or attitudes. Beyond this, the definition changes with each new generation of satirists, forming a loosely connected "satiric tradition" that is sometimes marked more as a satiric *mode* (as in the novel) than a strongly demarcated genre (such as verse satire). By nature, satire is often charged by moralistic ends, although at times the obscenity or vulgarity of individual works overpowers their moral content, conjuring images of the *satyr*, the mythological half-man, half-beast from which satire is traditionally said to have taken its name. The satires of one of the most successful literary ages, the Augustan age (1689-1750), are well known for their imitation of classical Greek and Roman

literature as well as their strict adherence to metrical and thematic unity in formal verse. On the contrary, the Romantic period, marked as the era between the start of the French Revolution (1789) and the passage of the Great Reform Bill (1832), is not generally thought of as an age of satire, particularly not as one that is focused on poetic satire. Although individual satires, such as Byron's *Don Juan*, have warranted continued discussion for their distinctive merits or as part of the larger Romantic Movement, the genre of satire as a whole during the Romantic era has been largely dismissed or marginalized as a "diminished" form of Augustan satire, lacking in poetic strength as well as satiric vigor, and therefore lacking importance as an object of literary study.

With a few landmark exceptions, scholarship on this topic has focused on negatives, often proclaiming the "decline" if not the "death" of verse satire in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century (Lockwood, Rawson), even though the genre of satire as a whole thrived commercially during the period, as Gary Dyer demonstrated with a catalogue of over 700 satiric titles in *British Satire and the Politics of Style* (1997). This negative scholarly outlook is the result of the lingering influence of formalist paradigms that assessed satires according to the standards and conventions of classical satire. Yet the imitative nature of the classical tradition as it was carried down by the Augustans stands at odds with the Romantic principles of poetic innovation and invention. Just as the prescribed characteristics used by the Augustans can be applied to non-satiric works, satire can take other forms, and in the Romantic era satires becomes particularly fluid in style, structure, and method. Because of this adaptability, satire is best defined according to how it acts or behaves, not how it looks or is structured, although I would argue that this action differs from what other scholars have identified as the "satiric mode" in that in verse, satire remains the dominant rhetoric whereas the satiric is accompanied by or even made subsidiary to other narrative modes. Measuring the aesthetic success or failure of Romantic-era satires according to older

classical and Augustan models has caused scholars to overlook what I will contend is a critical break with that same satiric tradition, a break necessitated by cultural changes within Britain in the wake of the French Revolution. The inability of scholars to recognize this break with tradition has led to a sociohistorical as well as an aesthetic undervaluation of satire in the Romantic canon.

The application of these standards and their basis in formalist and classicist approaches are evident in Thomas Lockwood's 1979 work, *Post-Augustan Satire*, when he asks "What happens to verse satire after Pope?" and "What goes wrong with it?" (3). Even though the formalist methodology behind Lockwood's assessment has faded in popularity in the almost 40 years since the publication of his study, the dismissive attitude demonstrated toward satire of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries has been slow to change. With the exception of more recent works such as Gary Dyer's *British Satire and the Politics of Style* (1997), Steven Jones's *Satire and Romanticism* (2003), and Andrew Stauffer's *Anger, Revolution and Romanticism* (2008), little has been said about the genre of verse satire as a whole. In contrast, scholarship on lyric poetry has flourished with examinations of the social, cultural and historical influences on the formation of uniquely Romantic verse. Like its lyric counterpart, Romantic satire evolved in response to contextual factors from within and without Great Britain. Like Lockwood, I ask "What happens to satire in the Romantic age?" I differ, however, by asking how it changes and adapts in response to heightened awareness of national identity and the ways in which these identities are marginalized, culturally, socially, and literarily, under the political construct of Great Britain. This heightened awareness causes satire to adopt themes of nationalistic rhetoric, transforming satire from a politically and socially conservative genre to one that advocates for political and social change.

While more recent works, such as those by Dyer and Stauffer, for example, have tended to focus on the changes in satiric tone due to the government's scrutiny of public rhetoric post-French

Revolution, I propose that new insight into the development and role of Romantic-era satire can be found by examining the more immediate British contexts of the Scottish Enlightenment (1681-1795) and the development of nationalism. The context in question is rooted in the English measures to prevent further rebellions such as the failed Jacobite uprisings of 1688, 1715, and 1745, which had resulted in the suppression of native customs and linguistic traditions. Lingering tensions between the central English government and Britain's non-English states, Scotland and Ireland, were once again thrust into the forefront of public discourse by the French Revolution since the government enacted further suppressive measures for fear that the Revolution would once again incite domestic rebellion. Under these circumstances, Scottish and Irish authors struggled to negotiate what Katie Trumpener calls "a shadowy half-life" (29) of nationality, the unwillingness to relinquish native identity and a corresponding unwillingness to adopt a vaguely defined British one in its place. Satirists responded to these government actions by means of a satiric discourse that precipitated a break with classical satiric tradition since it was shaped by the principles of the Scottish Enlightenment, especially those that emphasized nationalistic feeling.

The nationalistic feeling associated with the Enlightenment in Scotland in particular rises from key differences between the Scottish and continental models of Enlightenment thought. Scholars agree that there existed a universal intellectual movement unified by a set of generalized principles common among all strains of Enlightenment thought, principles that focused on the betterment of human society politically, socially, economically, and intellectually. However, most scholars, including Jonathan Israel and Richard Sher, also agree that there exist variations on what is typically considered the continental or mainstream Enlightenment, variations that are marked by the perspectives of their national and cultural origins, revealing what was in fact a multiplicity of Enlightenment movements. In his Introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to the Scottish*

Enlightenment, Alexander Broadie responds to critics who doubt the existence of a uniquely Scottish Enlightenment by saying that "the Enlightenment in Scotland was distinctively Scottish [since] a Scot writing on politics, economics, social structures, education, law or religion will think in terms of the politics, economics, society, education, law or religious dimension of his country, and it is impossible for his thought not to be affected by these distinctive features of his national context" (2). In truth, the Scottish Enlightenment was further yet fragmented between philosophical schools that closely mirrored the French strain of Enlightenment, and a more localized thread referred to as the "Common Sense" school spearheaded by Thomas Reid. Yet Broadie's assessment leaves something to be desired since the nationalism he suggests is a passive one in which the authors unconsciously shape and are unconsciously shaped by their cultural and geographic origins.

In actuality, nationalism in the Scottish Enlightenment is a more deliberate, willful attempt to unify and restore a disenfranchised people, a distinction that arises from the Scottish interpretation of the four stages theory of cultural development. As Trumpener summarizes, continental versions of the four stages model regard the progress of civilization as a deterministic progression from a hunting/gathering society to the eventual high-point of a commercial economy, with each stage eradicating and replacing the material determinants and cultural infrastructure of the previous society, a view that "amounts to a justification of imperialism" for mainstream Enlightenment historicists (29). The Scottish model, on the other hand, challenges this viewpoint by asserting that cultural change is often the result of "violent" outside forces (29), (such as imperialist conquest), and that "even where external forces succeed in disrupting the coherence of a national culture, and where an imperial culture is imposed in its place, the lasting force of national memory will ensure that its victory does not endure" (29). The theory's emphasis on the "survival of cultural

memory" (29) demonstrates an awareness of Scotland's own colonization by England as well as a deliberate desire to recover and preserve native traditions and culture.

This carries over into the principles of the Scottish Enlightenment as a whole and the literature of the time as an emphasis on nationalism and historicism. As Richard Sher argues in *Enlightenment and the Book*:

> Although Scottish and English intellectuals often interacted meaningfully during the eighteenth century,...there were powerful and distinct national traditions, patterns of thought, and social bonds among the Scottish literati that were often different from those that operated among their English counterparts. As we shall see, eighteenth-century Scottish men of letters were involved in a self-conscious attempt to glorify and improve the Scottish nation through the publication of learned and literary books. Even Scottish authors and publishers who resided in London were often bound by national ties and imbued with a strong sense of Scottish identity and national pride. (21)

Sher refers to the differences between the Scottish Enlightenment and what others have proposed is a more inclusive "British" Enlightenment; however, the distinction made here is also applicable to the differences between the Scottish and the continental Enlightenment. Although the Enlightenment in Scotland developed as something of a grass-roots variation on the continental Enlightenment, with political and historical characteristics resulting from the social and cultural unity among Scottish authors, the movement's principles eventually gained influence throughout Britain (and arguably the continent, although Sher limits the scope of his work to English-speaking audiences) due to the centralization of publishing in London and Dublin. This influence then manifested itself in such areas as Whig politics, educational reform, and literature, thanks to the

prominence of critical engines such as the *Edinburgh Review* (Allan, Sher). Given the wide-spread influence of Scottish Enlightenment authors, these principles constitute a part of the "national context" in which satire is shaped during the nineteenth century by helping to mold authorial responses to the political and social unrest prevalent in the British Empire during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

As a result of the influence of this nationalistic tone, satiric poetry essentially turns inward for inspiration, embracing philosophic strains suited to the overall structure of the British Empire as an assembly of native cultures by incorporating more indigenous mythology and folklore, poetic traditions, such as *flyting* (the exchange of insults between opponents), and native symbolism such as the figure of the bard. This use of native literary constructs results in a satiric poetry that is marked by distinctly nationalistic themes, including a positivist approach to improving life and advocating for the restoration of basic rights curtailed under anti-sedition efforts of the Tory-led government in the wake of the early eighteenth-century Scottish uprisings, and later renewed in the wake of the French Revolution. As a result, one of the primary shifts between Augustan or classical satire and a uniquely Romantic school of satire is the movement away from socially and politically conservative satire intended to maintain the status quo (Griffin, Greenberg, Dyer), toward a more active satire advocating for political and social reform.

Review of Literature

In his article "Flyting in the *Declaration of Independence* and *The Vision of Judgment*," (2007) Jonathan Gross examines the Scottish poetic tradition of flyting – the exchange of personal

insults – in two seemingly unconnected texts.[5] Indeed, given the lack of strong literary or social connections between Thomas Jefferson and Lord Byron, Gross concludes that the use of flyting in their respective works is the result of "the oppositional quality of liberal discourse" (44) and a common Scottish religious and intellectual inheritance (45). Although Gross only casually mentions Thomas Reid's Scottish school of Common Sense Philosophy, the similarities in intellectual backgrounds between Byron and Jefferson demonstrate the trans-Atlantic influence of the Scottish Enlightenment already noted by scholars such as Sher and Allan. Yet the similar use of flyting across different genres also suggests the natural connection between the linguistic hostility of satire and the "oppositional quality of liberal discourse," which also includes the rhetoric of nationalism. This connection suggests the two disparate threads of criticism that are most relevant to this project, the first being critical discussions of Romantic-era satire from roughly the past twenty years, and the second being discussions of the influence of nationalism as it grew out of the Scottish Enlightenment and its subsequent effect on Romanticism and British society in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. While the nature of the Scottish Enlightenment has been discussed in relation to the development of the Romantic lyric (Budge; Pittock; Duncan, Davis and Sorensen), this line of criticism has thus far never been directly applied to satire.

As stated above, positive criticism that evaluates Romantic satire for its own aesthetic or historical capital, rather than focusing on its deviation from Augustan models, is largely absent before Gary Dyer's *British Satire and the Politics of Style* (1997) revived a fledgling interest in the genre. Critics writing prior to Dyer's publication, such as Thomas Lockwood and Claude Rawson,

[5] Gross leaves the definition of *flyting* in the rather vague terms as a thread of Scottish literary tradition based on the exchange of hard-hitting, personal insults. Ward Parks more clearly describes this tradition as a form of "verbal contest" (439), or "an openly bellicose exchange of insults and boasts between warriors who frequently cap their argument with a martial encounter" (440).

tended to foster the idea of satire as a diminished genre thanks to formalist approaches that evaluated Romantic era satires according to their ability to achieve the same ferocity and technical mastery as classical satire. Lockwood (1979) admits that the satiric poems published after Pope include many works that cannot properly be regarded as formal verse satire and also notes a shift in theme from attacks on broadly defined moral abstractions to more topical, timely satires on social issues and institutions. Yet Lockwood neglects to offer alternative explanations and instead concludes that this shift is the result of the diminished importance of satire to both readers and writers of the period (6). Fifteen years later, Rawson likewise dismisses this shift in satire as a decline in poetic talent and a "popularizing or leveling down of popular letters" (xii), while Dustin Griffin's *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction* positions itself as an attempt to update critical theories of satire, but skips over the nineteenth century in its entirety. In contrast, Dyer's work has been hailed as a breakthrough study for its catalogue of over 700 satires published between 1789 and 1832, demonstrating that satire was in fact alive, flourishing, and evolving during the Romantic period. The sheer number of texts discussed in Dyer's work excludes the possibility of sustained discussion on specific pieces; so instead, the value of Dyer's study comes from his examination of the effects of increasingly stringent anti-libel, sedition and blasphemy measures on satire and print culture in general. This government-enacted censorship, he argues, forced satirists to undertake measures of self-censorship by combining traditional modes of playful Horatian and more ferocious Juvenalian satire into a "Radical satire" that was "more intricately ironic than either" of its parent forms (1).[6]

[6] Dyer also offers rather useful definitions of both Juvenalian and Horatian satire in the Romantic period, and it is his definitions which dominate this discussion throughout. In describing the tone or temperament of both satires, Dyer declares that "Juvenalian satire, akin to a tragic mode, is meant to induce fear and is uncompromisingly harsh and moralistic. Horatian satire, more attuned to the comic, aims at laughter or amusement, its poetic speaker being presented as mild, amicable, almost conciliatory" (39). Additionally, while the classical satires of Juvenal and Horace show no significant difference in form, "most Juvenalian satires of the Romantic period are written in heroic couplets of elevated rhetoric, [while] other satires use not only more colloquial language but also intrinsically comic triple meters and iambic tetrameter couplets (hudibrastics)" (Dyer 40).

What Dyer identifies as a combination of modes, the Juvenalian anger subsumed into Horatian verse patterns is what previous scholars have identified as Romantic verse satire's apparent lack of poetic strength and classically satiric vigor.

More scholarship focusing on satire's literary and historical impact follows with the publication of Steven Jones's *Satire and Romanticism* (2000) and the collection of essays, *The Satiric Eye* (2003), which Jones edited. In *Satire and Romanticism*, Jones considers the ways in which non-satiric Romantic poetry took shape against the satiric as a unique cultural product of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. He argues that satire serves as a catalyst for change in Romantic literature, a theory supported through his adoption of Gary Taylor's concept of Cultural Selection, which is loosely based on evolutionary models. He continues this thread of criticism in his introduction to *The Satiric Eye* when he says that scholars "have begun the process of measuring the role and influence of Romantic-period satire" (6), but "The greatest critical interest in these cases lies at the complex borderline between constructions of the Romantic and the satiric" (7). Jones's focus on the "borderline" between satire and Romanticism, as well as the "and" of the title *Satire and Romanticism*, indicates his primary assumption that satire is a genre exclusive of Romanticism and vice versa. Additionally, his focus on satire as a catalyst for the formation of a Romantic cannon suggests the view that satire is itself a stable, unchanging genre. Yet Jones neglects the corollary to his argument: if Romanticism is a "cultural organism" vulnerable to environmental and cultural forces, so is satire, leaving room for the examination of the role of these same forces in shaping Romantic-era satire as a unique cultural product.

In fact, one of the essays contained in *The Satiric Eye*, "Verbal Jujitsu: William Hone and the Tactics of Satiric Conflict" by Kyle Grimes hits on this very issue. Grimes argues that the key issue plaguing, and thereby hindering, constructive criticism of Romantic satire "involves the central

definition (or definitions) of such a broad literary type as satire" (173). He notes the typical distinction between satire as a conservative genre geared toward the preservation of literary, cultural, and moral norms, and Romanticism, which "points toward some aesthetic, ideological or even spiritual ideal that is yet to be realized" (174), definitions that would seemingly position satire and Romanticism as mutually exclusive, if not oppositional genres, as Jones has argued. Yet, Grimes boldly asserts that "these conventional ways of thinking about satire are limiting, misleading, and sometimes flatly inaccurate in an early nineteenth-century context" (174). Despite this insight, Grimes's essay primarily revolves around identifying a grouping of Romantic satire he calls "hacker satire," a sub-genre that essentially overlaps Gary Dyer's identification of "Radical satire," although Grimes does identify unique characteristics about the way satire behaves or functions in the early nineteenth century. Satire is "parasitic, derivative, opportunistic, or parodic" and "definable by the role it plays in very immediate and historically specific discursive power struggles" (174). Dyer proposes the argument that satire, like its lyric counterpart, is subject to the influences of its cultural context, in particular the political upheaval of early nineteenth-century Britain.

Michael Scrivener's review of *The Satiric Eye* argues that:

> Before 1980, Romantic satire was a subject for maybe an article, but now, as is evident in Jones's essay collection, it is a field, reflecting one area of canon expansion, as a neglected archive receives its due attention. How the genre of satire had come to be neglected is a story unto itself, revealing the ideological investments of earlier constructions of Romanticism. (154)

While Scrivener notes that Jones's compilation is likely to draw attention to an understudied, and thus far under-recognized Romantic genre, little has been done in this area since the book's 2003 publication. The only major book-length critical studies relevant to satire in the last 15 years are Ian

Haywood's *Bloody Romanticism* (2006) and Andrew Stauffer's *Anger, Revolution and Romanticism* (2008), both of which are concerned less directly with satire than with the effects of the French Revolution on expressions of violence and anger respectively, in Romantic poetry as a whole, although Stauffer's work gives great insight into the altered nature of satiric invective during the Romantic era. An individual essay by Steven Jones also appears in *A Companion to Satire* (2007), a more generic work covering the gamut of satiric development in Britain and America. In this essay, Jones notes that the tone and subject matter of satire changed over the course of the early nineteenth century, in keeping with the political tenor of the French Revolution and its impact on British politics as the government responded to various internal struggles. While Jones, Dyer, and Stauffer contribute worthwhile arguments to the understanding of the tone and function of Romantic satire, their arguments are geared toward examining satire through the lens of the French Revolution and the ways in which it highlighted the British internal struggle for unity and individual liberty.

However, this internal struggle must also be examined according to the social, political, and historical factors at play within the British nation, and a key influence on the people's reaction to these struggles can be found in the rise of nationalism against a growing trend of Anglicization. Katie Trumpener's study of the novel, *Bardic Nationalism* (1997), is widely recognized by scholars as having helped revive interest in issues of Scottish and Irish literary influence during the Romantic era (which she credits to the Scottish Enlightenment) by paying particular attention to the expression of national culture in the Celtic states belonging to Britain, despite the efforts of English writers to dismiss native cultural traditions. Trumpener argues that:

> Responding in particular to Enlightenment dismissals of Gaelic oral traditions, Irish and Scottish antiquaries reconceive national history and literary history under the

> sign of the bard. According to their theories, bardic performance binds the nation together across time and across social divides; […] A figure both of the traditional aristocratic culture that preceded English occupation and of continued national resistance to that occupation, the bard symbolizes the central role of literature in defining national identity. (xii)

While Trumpener focuses on the novel, the figure of the bard, whether directly invoked in Burns's "humble Bardie" or Byron's "English Bards," or indirectly called forth in Moore's iconic imagery, remains a steadfast figure in satiric poetry of the time, underpinning the satirist's argument with the force of nationalist rhetoric and purpose. This rhetoric stands at odds with the Anglicizing effects of English cultural dominance and through the figure of the bard, the satirist retains a "distinct, national, and non-English character" (16) in contrast to the "systematic underdevelopment of Englishness" (15). However, while Trumpener's argument focuses on maintaining cultural and national distinctiveness, the dynamic quality of satire, exemplified in the ways in which the satirist seeks to excise undesirable characteristics associated with national identity, or to reverse the systemic oppression of the nation, creates a bardic figure who is more activist that passive observer.

Other scholars have noted this dismissal and continuing marginalization of Scottish culture after the 1707 Act of Union and into the nineteenth century (and the parallel rejection of Irish culture). One contemporary example is evident in the letter written by William Wordsworth to R. P. Gillies on February 14, 1815, in which Wordsworth critiques Scottish writing as lacking "any pretension to be called English" (qtd in Davis et al. 1). In the Introduction to *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism* (2004), Leith Davis, Ian Duncan and Janet Sorensen argue that the tension between English and Scottish writers demonstrated in Wordsworth's letter is both the origin and

continuing symptom of a persisting view of Romanticism as an Anglo-centric movement that has marginalized Scottish Romanticism in particular as "inauthentic" – sacrificing historical authenticity to a "facsimile" that is overly glamorized for the sake of national feeling. They assert that this view overlooks the numerous innovations of the Scottish Enlightenment and the significant influence of key literary magazines of the day, *The Edinburgh Review, Blackwood's Edinburgh Review,* and *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal* (3). Davis et al. accurately uncover the initial bias against Scottish (and by extension Irish) dialect and literature, a prejudice that has been unjustly carried over into scholarly examinations of Romantic era poetry, as writers such as Thomas Moore have been summarily dismissed and neglected for such "inauthentic" expressions of nationalism. This gap in scholarship, however, operates on the assumption that Scottish and Irish literature ought to behave in accordance with distinctly English traditions, and ignores the various contributions of non-English writers to the body of literature recognized under the seemingly more inclusive banner of "Britishness."

In *Scotland, Ireland, and the Romantic Aesthetic*, Duff and Jones, like Davis et al., pick up on the trend of de-centering and de-Anglicizing Romanticism in order to examine Romantic literary history in terms of these Irish and Scottish contributions and a "pluralist and multicultural interpretation of the [literary] history of the British Isles" as called for by J.G.A. Pocock (12). They cite the work of E.W. McFarland in demonstrating various overlapping and juxtaposed cultural threads that "overturn the single-nation paradigm on which historical scholarship has often rested, and complicate too the triangular model that sees Scotland and Ireland as mutually contrasted 'Others' against which an English 'self' is asserted" (13). They position the essays included in their volume as an "exploration of this Scottish-Irish 'public sphere'" (13), a continuation of McFarland's theme as well as the investigation of cultural exchange throughout Britain proposed by Trumpener.

This multi-national approach foregrounds the necessity of considering each author in this study from a specific cultural and historical standpoint, asserting individual literary and national traditions that stand apart from the vague English "self," and how these individual identities are performed in the public literary sphere and act to influence the wider English readership. As Duff and Jones assert, adopting a comparative method of analysis mimics the "self-consciousness" of Romanticism (13) that "[attends] to the ideological work that Romantic literature itself performs in constructing and interrogating such concepts as nation and national identity" (14). That these methods are encased specifically in the mode of Romantic satire illustrates the underlying anxiety and dis-ease apparent for the authors in being a member of such marginalized national identities in the face of the more acceptable, albeit vague and undefined Englishness.

Similarly, David Allan's argument in *Making British Culture* (2008) attempts to de-Anglicize discussions of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century intellectual advancements by pointing to the Anglicizing effect of scholarship persisting from the eighteenth through the twenty-first century. This scholarship reinforces the tendency to think of intellectual advances as originating in England specifically, or at least as a product of a *British* Enlightenment that gives more credence to the role of English influence over Scottish developments rather than the opposite (4). Although his argument focuses primarily on the debate surrounding the concepts of a Scottish Enlightenment that is separate and distinct from the English or British Enlightenment, his argument bears relevance for issues of nationalism and the status of non-English writers within an English-dominated market. Thus, like Sher, Allan is concerned with the impact of Scottish philosophy on a contemporary audience, particularly as it relates to the development of nationalistic sympathy in the formation of a national literary canon as specific Scottish authors and works were subsumed into English culture via the label of "Briton" rather than Scottish or English.

Although Davis et al. critique Murry Pittock's earlier works for accusing Scottish authors such as Scott and MacPherson of an "inauthentic Romanticism" (8), Pittock's more recent works, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism* (2008) and the essay "Enlightenment, Romanticism, and the Scottish Canon: Cosmopolites or Narrow Nationalists?" featured in the *Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature* (2012), reflect a more positive attitude toward Romanticism's expression of nationalism. In his book, Pittock mentions the "importance of *Gemeinschaft* as a cultural construction of the 'ideal community' of the nation in the Romantic era, one that was especially present in Scotland" (*Scottish and Irish Romanticism*, 6). Through his work, he hopes to establish a more "inclusive Romanticism" and "the importance of a distinctively Scottish and Irish Romanticism in particular" (6-7) based on the principles of "a separate public sphere in Scotland and Ireland," the inflections of genre and the use of hybrid language, reclamation of a national past through symbolic images, and "the cultural option open to Scottish and Irish writers to perform a distinctive self in diaspora" (7). These features contribute to what Pittock terms "altermentality" that, when summed up, results in the concept of "the survival of a separately performed national self in Scotland and Ireland" (27) and the concept of "fratriotism" that "arises from conflicting loyalties generated by inclusion in a state with which one does not fully identify" (28). These conflicting loyalties are exemplified by the satiric bite found in the poems discussed within this study, as each poet reacts to or resists the eroding force of Anglicization to assert a nationality that is considered lesser, or unacceptable to a wider British social, literary, and political public.

Argument Overview and Chapter Summary

While the majority of studies discussing the relationship of the Scottish Enlightenment and Romanticism focus on the issue of nationality, the highly-politicized genre of satire gives this issue

even greater significance. As demonstrated by Gary Dyer and Kyle Grimes's identification of Radical/Hacker satire, the political advocacy of these satires often takes issue with the oppressive measures enacted by the British government to prevent seditious uprisings because of the persistent fear of a recurrence of the French Revolution on home soil. These government measures of oppression, in the eyes of "British" authors[7] bring into question issues of nationality on all counts, considering three factors: lingering anti-Scottish attitudes that complicated matters between the English and their northern counterparts; anti-sedition measures aimed specifically at Ireland after the Irish Rebellion of 1798; and the effect of anti-sedition measures such as the Six Acts that served to curtail basic British rights such as freedom of assembly. Taking all three aspects of national tension into consideration, Radical satirists, most of whom identified with Whig politics, addressed not only political and cultural tensions relating to the inclusion of Scotland and Ireland into a unified British identity, but also advocated the return of basic freedom for English citizens as well.

Chapter 1: "Tell them wi' a patriot-heat": Robert Burns and Scottish national identity

Chapter 1 examines the most prominent or well-recognized satires of Robert Burns and the ways in which these satires contend with what Burns sees as the negative influences harming the Scottish nation and by extension, Scottish identity. In this chapter, I argue that the apparent split focus, clerical and political, of Burns's satires illustrates a two-sided battle against both internal and external forces harming Scottish cultural identity: the Scottish people are impaired internally by the negative influence of Auld Licht or Orthodox Calvinism and externally by the linguistic and cultural

[7] For the moment we will leave this term to mean authors who are geographically identified with the "four nations" known as Britain – England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales – rather than authors who specifically identify themselves as having British nationality.

dominance of English customs and manners. These influences are destructive since, on the clerical side, Orthodox practices apparently affirm English stereotypes of the Scottish people as ignorant, backward, and hostile, thanks to what Burns calls "superstition" and the self-aggrandizing hypocrisy he sees in many church leaders, while on the political side, the English government continues to erode Scottish cultural and economic well-being by enacting legislation that harms Scottish industry and supplants Scots dialect with standard English as the language of government, business, and the arts. This dual argument demonstrates the ways in which identity is harmed by both internal and external forces. It frames Burns's sense of Scottish identity according to prescriptive, not descriptive means, specifically as he argues for the more humanistic and educated religious practices of New Licht or Moderate Calvinism to replace Orthodoxy, while also affirming the political and literary validity of the Scottish dialect and rejecting a pattern of Anglicization and English dominance. Once the oppressive influence of Auld Licht is removed, Scotland can battle against England on equal grounds, signified by the "humble bardie's" ability to cross geographical and political borders to participate in wider political conversations.

Chapter 2: "Whispering in Doorways": Thomas Moore and Satiric Sedition

In Chapter 2, I will examine the satires of Irish poet Thomas Moore and trace their stylistic and political development as a tool for combatting English state oppression. Whereas Scotland had faired more favorably during their 1707 union with Britain, both politically and economically, Ireland's forced union with Britain resulted in several anti-Irish directives that were only slowly beginning to be repealed throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. These directives severely hindered opportunities for social and professional advancement among the Irish and were often the cause for young men to seek their fortunes "abroad" in England, and to adopt

English manners and customs – to essentially relinquish Irish identity and embrace a more socially acceptable English front. Thomas Moore, like many of his fellow Irishmen, relocated to London and found himself under English patronage, and like Burns, his lyric works primarily upheld those nationalistic themes examined by Katie Trumpener. His satires, such as *Corruption and Intolerance, The Sceptic,* and the *Two-Penny Post Bag*, however, advocated for Irish political freedoms. Moore's satires have been largely ignored by scholars in favor of his more overtly patriotic works, such as the *Irish Melodies*, yet an examination of the satires' development reveals three important observations: the shift in technique from Augustan-based and Juvenalian satire to a lighter, more stylistically flexible Horatian mode; the later satires as an outgrowth of the *Irish Melodies*; and the epistolary format's use of multiple narrators as a device to evade increasingly restrictive anti-sedition laws.

In these poems, the epistolary format breaks with the Augustan satiric tradition while the multiple perspectives of the letters allow Moore a certain level of deniability to protect himself against charges of sedition, since no one specific voice can be definitively identified as expressing Moore's political views. This epistolary format, with its changing perspectives, voices, and attitudes, illustrates the dual faces or personas the author must adopt in order to maintain an acceptable reputation within a "foreign" culture, a prime example of the author writing "in diaspora." In this chapter, I will argue that in the shift from Juvenalian to Horatian mode satire, he develops a technique of "verbal peek-a-boo," a way in which Moore is able to drop in and out of his text to express those seditious beliefs that would otherwise leave him open to prosecution. Moore likewise uses this technique of hidden versus visible behavior in order to expose the wrongdoing of key political figures, including the Prince Regent, to dismantle the political and cultural English hierarchy

to demonstrate that the Irish are socially, culturally, and intellectually equal to their English colleagues.

Chapter 3: "Of Wrath and Rhyme": Byron's English Bards and Scotch Reviewers and the Struggle for National Identity

As the star satirist of the Romantic age, Lord Byron also presents a complicated national heritage worth examining. In this chapter, I discuss the ways in which Byron's dual heritage as Scottish and English influences and complicates the national identity expressed in his early poetic volume, *Hours of Idleness* and how that complication translates into the Juvenalian satire, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*. As the heir to an English title, and the son of an aristocratic but impoverished Scottish mother, Byron's first published collection, *Hours of Idleness* contains several poems exhibiting Ossianic nuances or nostalgia for the Scottish countryside of Byron's boyhood, overtones that were pointed out and ridiculed in the *Edinburgh Review*'s critique of the volume. Highlighting these references subjected Byron to the stereotypical critiques of the Scottish and l aid bare his lingering insecurities regarding his Scottish origins and lack of English status (being a minor and a low ranking noble). His outrage at the slight offered him by the *Edinburgh Review* over *Hours of Idleness* is well documented in his first satire, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers.* The title's literal references to English poets and the Scottish-based Edinburgh Review is obvious, however, the title also seems to mirror a social, cultural, and intellectual divide suggested within the text of the poem: those who can write poetry (the English), and those who critique because they cannot (the Scottish, or those allied with them). He declares that "These are the Bards to whom the Muse must bow; / While Milton, Dryden, Pope, alike forgot, / Resign their hallow'd Bays to Walter Scott" (126-129). His list of eminent Augustan poets sets up a division between old and new, between the

classical school of poetry and the emerging Romantics; however, the poets he lists as poetic masters are also definitively English, in contrast to Scott.

By allying himself with the *English* bards, he attempts to distance himself from the Scottish nationality that had long been a point of contention, socially and intellectually, yet an analysis of *EBSR* as an outgrowth of *Hours of Idleness* reveals the ways in which Byron attempted to resolve lingering anxieties about his national identity. In *Hours of Idleness*, Byron uses a pattern of feminine imagery to imagine and personify Scotland, an imagery that, in these early poems, affirms both his early cultural identity as well as his masculinity. After the critique of *Hours of Idleness*, Byron imbues this feminine imagery with the negative attributes associated with Scotland, and turns this imagery against the reviewers who had savaged his first volume. Byron also attacks the modern poets of the day based on moral as well as stylistic grounds, basing his measure of morality on the standards of behavior expected of urban gentlemen and the aristocracy. Byron uses *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* to reframe a paradigm of national identity in which an author's identity is defined by these standards of behavior. The negative imagery brandished against the Scottish reviewers subsequently identifies Scottish identity as inferior and undesirable, an inferiority that portrays their failure to uphold literary standards as a failure of masculinity. I argue that Byron's use of feminine imagery suggests that nationality is both dependent on and influenced by the subject's ability to demonstrate acceptable standards of gentlemanly behavior, and implies that English, aristocratic masculinity is superior to the behaviors and attitudes expressed by non-English authors and critics.

An examination of these three poets brings new relevance to studies of Romantic era satire in two ways. Firstly, by focusing on individual, representative poets, this study sheds new light on previously neglected or overlooked works by Burns, Moore, and Byron, granting new insights into

the development of their entire body of work. Secondly, all three of these authors combine the figure of the bard, a historically nationalist figure, with the role of the satirist, a merger that transforms satire into an overtly nationalist, not just a political, genre. This combination and its apparent recurrence in the works of all three satirists is suggestive of a wider, more universal change occurring throughout Romantic satire, as poetry adapts and transforms in an era of ongoing political unrest and nationalist awareness.

Chapter 1

"Tell them wi' a patriot-heat"[8]: Robert Burns and Scottish National Identity

> "Though much indebted to your goodness, I do not approach you, my Lords and Gentlemen, in the usual stile of dedication, to thank you for past favours; that path is so hackneyed by prostituted Learning, that honest Rusticity is ashamed of it. –Nor do I present this Address with the venal soul of a servile Author, looking for a continuation of those favours: I was bred to the Plough, and am independent. I come to claim the common Scottish name with you, my illustrious Countrymen; and to tell the world that I glory in the title."

Robert Burns's dedication to his subscribers at the beginning of the Edinburgh edition of *Poems Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect* (1787) presents an interesting contrast. Burns, a farmer "bred to the plough," both accepts the patronage of "Lords and Gentlemen" and rejects the role of "servile Author," a statement that displays certain assumptions regarding the relationship between patron and author. These assumptions adhere to the common eighteenth-century stereotype of the literary hack and suggestively portray authors as dependent sycophants, using their talents for flattery to secure financial gain. This contrast and the diction used to create it would seemingly challenge the display of gratitude due his supporters. His use of words such as "venal" and "servile" portray authorship under such conditions as a matter of moral failing, subject to influence and personal benefit; throughout, Burns's diction gives the appearance of establishing a moral, social, and economic distinction between himself and his patrons. This disparity is emphasized in his

[8] "The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer", line 65

contrast between the "prostituted Learning" of traditional patronage systems and the "honest Rusticity" Burns seems to claim for himself. In practice, Burns sought patronage to support his plans of becoming an Excise man (McIntyre 183),[9] and was not opposed to the practice of filling ministerial appointments via aristocratic patronage (McGinty 47). With this in mind, his insistence on denying for himself the character of patron-supported author is significant in that it suggests that Burns has reservations about the standard view of the relationship between *authorship* and patronage. He follows this rejection with the declaration that "I come to claim the Scottish name with you," an assertion that puts Burns, the humble farmer, on equal national terms with his aristocratic patrons. What then, is Burns getting at? The answer is that the dedication serves as a type of manifesto, a rejection of literary conventions defining and constraining national authorship, and instead substituting a type of prescriptive, not descriptive, national identity.

The inconsistencies presented in the dedication, as well as this suggested redefinition of national identity arise at various points throughout Burns's body of works, offering a complex view of Scottish identity and nationalism. For Burns, Scottishness is an identity that is complicated by two antagonistic forces – externally, the English-based government and internally, the faction of the Scottish Kirk that ascribed to a theological paradigm known as "Auld Licht Calvinism." On the one hand, the English government, represented in the dedication by the "Lords and Gentlemen" of the Caledonian Hunt, imposes laws and legislation that benefit the English economy and political situation, usually to the detriment of Scotland. Additionally, the political, financial, and cultural dominance of England leads to a process of Anglicization and Scottish cultural erosion. On the other hand, Scottish culture was dominated by the actions of the Scottish Kirk, which fulfilled many of the

[9] Burns also thought of accepting a farming lease from his friend, Patrick Miller, who had provided Burns with travelling money for his journey to Edinburgh before the publication of the Edinburgh edition. (McIntyre 110).

roles of a governing body, including such things as disciplining parishioners, creating in essence what amounted to a local theocratic government. Although references to religion are absent in the dedication, Burns sees the dominance of Auld Licht Calvinism as not only an oppressive force spiritually, politically, and intellectually, but also a contributing factor in many of the stereotypes used to justify the English government's anti-Scottish stance due to the severity of Auld Licht doctrine.

In this chapter, I will argue that in Burns's satires, he reframes Scottish identity according to opposition to government interference as well as the negative influence of the Scottish Kirk, advocating for the more liberal, educated, and humanistic Christianity of New Licht Calvinism to replace the severity of Auld Licht, while also combatting the effects of linguistic and political Anglicization and English dominance. In his poems, Scottish culture rises absent the weighty and domineering influence of Auld Licht teachings to be replaced by the more enlightened, humanistic, and intellectual theology of New Licht Calvinism. While many scholars have examined the cultural and literary weight of Burns's satires, and others such as such as J. Walter McGinty and Robert Crawford have specifically focused on representations of religion or culture, linguistics, and nationality in these works, integrated discussion of Burns's political and religious satires as a group has been lacking. Scholars have tended to comment on the religious satires independently, or on the satires in relation to the specific events they document, or have discussed Burns's work in terms of dialect or literary heritage without extended discussion of the poems at all.[10] The thematic differences between the political and religious satires would seem to justify this division in academic attention. However, while Burns's collections of poems as a whole serve to affirm and

[10] Murray Pittock, in his chapter on Burns included in *Scottish and Irish Romanticism*, only mentions *Holy Fair* once and discusses none of the other poems examined in this chapter.

promote Scottish identity, his satires in particular engage in a dual-fronted battle in which he argues against the constricting legislation of the English governing body, while also mocking and correcting the overbearing influence of Auld Licht and its theologies.[11] Thus, these two seemingly disparate satirical targets should be discussed in conjunction to examine the ways in which they demonstrate Burns's attitudes toward Scottish identity. Once the oppressive influence of Auld Licht is removed, Scotland can battle against England on equal grounds, signified by the "humble bardie's" ability to cross geographical and political borders to participate in wider political conversations.

This shift from local to national is evident in the publication history of Burns's poems as well as their content and construction. Burns wrote several satires between 1784 and 1786, including *The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer*, *The Holy Tulzie* (also known as *The Twa Herds), Holy Willie's Prayer, Epistle to John Goldie, Holy Fair, A Dream, Address to the Unco Guid,* and *The Ordination*.[12] However, each of these poems falls into one of three groups with varying levels of public exposure for each group: The Kilmarnock Edition of *Poems Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect,* the Edinburgh Edition, or posthumous publications. This latter category, the posthumous poems, creates a glitch in the chronological organization of Burns's works. The three poems, *The Twa Herds*, *Holy Willie's Prayer*, and *Epistle to John Goldie*, along with *Holy Fair*, are some of the earliest poems Burns composed, dating between 1784 and 1785 and all were circulated among his coterie in manuscript form, yet the personal and incendiary nature of the poems led Burns to exclude all but *Holy Fair* in the Kilmarnock Edition of his works. The others were never published formally until after Burns's death. As Nigel Leask explains, Burns's first volume targeted the local audience of Kilmarnock in

[11] Auld Licht practices included such beliefs as preordination, original sin, an extreme adherence to the Westminster Confession above and beyond scripture, literal interpretations of Biblical passages (what Burns terms "Superstition"), and a steadfast opposition to the practice of patronage. (McGinty, 34-35, 184-185)
[12] While all eight poems listed here bear relevance to Burns's argument, *Epistle to John Goldie*, and *The Ordination* will be omitted from the discussion in the interest of time and unity.

such a way as to capitalize on "the existing local reputation of his poems that had circulated in manuscript" ("Robert Burns," 75), however, Burns chose to withhold certain works from the published edition since they had already angered some of the local, more Orthodox, residents and he feared drawing the ire of the local Kirk Session. The volume instead included *The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer* and *A Dream*, satires attacking the English government for restrictions on the whiskey trade in Scotland and King George III's extravagant birthday celebration, in addition to *Holy Fair*. Burns added many more anti-clerical satires to the Edinburgh edition, including *The Ordination* and *Address to the Unco Guid*, satires that would "[play] well with the Moderate churchmen of the Edinburgh Enlightenment" (Leask, "Robert Burns," 79). In both volumes, Burns demonstrates a heightened awareness to the sensitivities and allegiances of his audience by excluding or including poems according to the audience's religious beliefs. While Leask notes that Burns was more open with his anti-clerical (as well as political) satires in the Edinburgh edition, this is not the only key difference between the volumes.

Burns's satires and the attitude toward national identity expressed in them provide a foundation for examining the later expressions of national identity in the works of Thomas Moore and Lord Byron; however, they also provide a striking counter example based on contrasts in literary style and linguistics. One might expect these variances to be the result of differences in social class, given that Burns represents the humbler, less wealthy agricultural class, while Moore represents the social darling of genteel society and Byron embodies the wealthy aristocrat. Yet, this assumption is faulty given Byron's early impoverished beginnings and Moore's origins as the son of a Dublin grocer. Instead, the differences between the poets can more easily be described according to the ways in which education, not social class, shaped the resultant works. Moore and Byron studied at Dublin College and Cambridge respectively, universities that followed the formal English

education system based on the classical tradition, with a heavy emphasis on Latin, imitation, and Augustan poetry. Such a system privileged the art of classical satire, but also favored and promoted standard English writing and elocution. Eighteenth-century Scotland ascribed to the belief in and attempt at universal literacy, although McIntyre admits this sometimes occurred more in theory than in practice (13), while also noting that the more educated Scottish citizens of the eighteenth century were prone to taking elocution classes that emphasized the English accent over broad Scots (McIntyre 122). Yet Burns, unlike most of his contemporaries, was largely educated at home via a private tutor and the oversight of close relatives (McIntyre 13-20, Leask, "Robert Burns," 72), an educational approach that resulted in a much less formal and standardized curriculum, although Burns was widely read. The lack of emphasis on standard English elocution and classical literary styles found in this home education most likely explains why Burns more readily adopted the traditional Scottish Habbie stanza (later dubbed the Burns stanza in his honor) and why, although he attempted classical verse and demonstrated a facility with English in his prose, that Burns refused to write in English, even against the advice of friends and publishers (McIntyre 122).

These educational differences shape multiple aspects of the poets' satires, but effectively place Burns in a separate category in terms of style, tradition, and literary persona. Burns, the oldest poet of the three, capitalizes on his non-standard education in order to promote traditional Scottish verse forms as well as the Scottish vernacular in opposition to the growing Anglicization of Scottish literature and speech. In general, the use of broad Scots lends itself to more pedestrian topics such as rural farm life in Burns's pastoral-themed poetry, but in satire the vernacular becomes a sharp vehicle for criticism: the English government is censured and undermined by a dialect that is supposedly held out to be inferior, while the Auld Licht denomination is subjected to criticism from within their own culture instead of commanding the steadfast obedience demanded

by their doctrine. The combination of broad Scots dialect and home education enables Burns to adopt readily the persona of the "Heaven-taught ploughman" he describes in his dedication, a role that enables him to skirt censure at least partially for his anti-government satires, even while sharpening their sting by pitting the political and social elite against a supposedly ignorant farmer. Burns's view of national identity, then, is shaped according to a non-standard educational program that bypassed the fundamental Anglicization of more mainstream curricula. This sense of identity then, promotes a general sense of Scottish nationalism by using these same characteristics of the "humble Bardie" to contest the English right to rule over Scotland, a nation that shares few if any cultural, linguistic, or ethnic similarities.

On the other hand, Moore and Byron both write from within the classical system, adopting and adapting to the expectations of an English audience, which also includes assumptions regarding personal behavior. Moore's interactions with college administrators and government officials during the Uprising of 1798 demonstrate a keen awareness of issues of gentlemanly conduct and honorable behavior, while Byron's status as a peer puts emphasis on these behaviors as part of normal social conduct and acceptability, both inside the university and out. Both men write and attack their satiric targets, according to the expectations of gentlemanly conduct and their targets' failure to adhere to those standards. This presents a type of nationalism in which cultural identity is tied to behavior as well as literary tradition. As we will see, both authors use this distinction to their advantage, with Moore presenting gentlemanly behavior and criticism of others in such a way that he seeks to admit himself to the higher ranks of the social elite, while Byron, contrarily, attempts to use those same behavioral codes as a method of exclusion. For Byron, this redefinition of national identity and authorship using behavior as an excluding measure ultimately proves false as he comes to accept and even admire many of his satiric targets in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*. For

Moore, a conduct-based approach to national identity is slightly more successful, in that his conduct enables him to move within English society as an equal while maintaining his Irish persona, even though such actions open him to accusations of inauthenticity and careerism by his peers. Burns's method of prescriptive identity, however, is keen to emphasize traditional cultural and linguistic characteristics while eliminating the negative influences of Anglicization and overbearing religious influence in favor of humanistic beliefs. This complex view of nationality both preserves national culture and allows that culture to move forward as part of Great Britain.

"Scots wha hae": Scotland, Kirk, and State

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Scotland occupied a problematic position in the newly formed nation known as Great Britain. The Act of Union of 1707 had subsumed Scotland officially into the British state while granting a level of political autonomy; yet lingering social, cultural, and ideological differences held Scotland at odds with its political parent. These differences were both the result of and fuel for anti-Scottish sentiment throughout the century, as the British undertook measures such as the Highland Clearances in an attempt to prevent repetitions of the Jacobite uprising of 1688, measures that resulted in the dissolution of the traditional clan system and the suppression of native cultural traditions. In the Introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature*, editors Gerard Carruthers and Liam McIlvanney remark that:

> Three watershed dates – 1560, 1603, and 1707 – invite us to plot the trajectory of Scottish literature against the nation's mutating constitutional status. The Protestant Reformation, The Union of the Crowns, and the Union of the Parliaments: There is a sense in which each of these events represents a realignment and, arguably, an impairment of native cultural identity. Taken together, these events

> have been read as staging posts on a process of regrettable Anglicization in post-medieval Scotland. (1)

As Carruthers and McIlvanney assert, the shifting political status of Scotland no doubt affected cultural identity, yet their opening statement is limited in that it only addresses the obviously political factors influencing Scotland's shifting identity in the eighteenth century and appears to overlook the religious and cultural tensions occurring within Scotland at the same time.

One primary conflict with England stemmed from the simultaneous existence of two national churches after the Act of Union, a conflict that essentially tangled political and religious differences into one long-standing issue. The two churches consisted of the Anglican church, which operated independently of the English government, and the Scottish Kirk, which in reality resembled a governing body in structure (being ranked according to a geographical hierarchy) as well as in function. Stewart Brown summarizes the situation in *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain* when he says that, "Scottish Presbyterian political theory insisted that the church and state were two separate and distinct societies – 'two kingdoms' – one under the sole headship of Christ and one under the worldly monarch. […] and it implied a Christian right to resist an 'ungodly' monarch who declined to uphold the true Reformed faith" (264). Despite this insistence upon separation, the Kirk assumed such duties as oversight of education, poor relief, and basic legal duties in disciplining parishioners, social responsibilities typically exercised by various levels of central government. According to Andrew Noble and Patrick Scott Hogg, Editors of *The Canongate Burns*, undertaking these governmental functions effectively created a "darker, more theocratically controlled state" (35) within Scotland that stood at odds with the British government, particularly on the issue of appointing church leaders. J. Walter, McGinty expands on this issue in *Robert Burns and Religion* when he says that:

> [The] hard won right of a congregation to be able to choose a minister needing only the approval of the local Presbytery […] had been established by law in 1690 and ratified in the Act of Union of 1707. The Act of 1690 had restored the system of church government, whereby the Church had the freedom to govern itself by means of kirk sessions, presbyteries, provincial synods and general assemblies, a system that had been in place since 1592, but that had been threatened and in part denied to the Church during the Restoration period from 1660-1690. The Patronage Act of 1712 [which restored the right of the heritors to present a minister to a vacant parish] was seen by many in the Church not only to have violated the Act of 1690, but to have infringed the Act of Union of 1707 which had ratified the earlier Act and in which the rights and Presbyterian polity of the Church had been enshrined and assured. (185)

The passage of the Patronage Act of 1712 remained a point of contention, and sometimes even violent protest, within Scotland for the duration of the eighteenth century, and as McGinty notes, divided opinions over the Act resulted in the development of different factions within the Kirk, factions that were later to be identified as "Auld Licht," and "New Licht" Calvinists.

Within Scotland, the theological remnants of the Protestant Reformation continued to direct daily life thanks to the cultural and theological dominance of the Kirk, which promoted "a generic Calvinism that presupposed a national establishment of religion and unchanging doctrinal norms" (Gribben 112). However, as Crawford Gribben argues, these norms would be continuously challenged throughout the century: "in terms of ecclesiology, by secession from the establishment; in terms of theology, with the emergence of biblical rationalism; in terms of liturgy, with the popularization of hymn singing; and in terms of culture, with the increasing influence of

Enlightenment skepticism and print capitalism, and with the impact of democratic sentiment in the wider context of the European and American revolutions" (113). The conservative "Auld Licht" branch, as they came to be known, subscribed to a more orthodox rendering of Calvinism that was based on theological doctrines such as Predestination and Original Sin, as well as a strict adherence to church authority, which prompted their resistance to the patronage act as an English interference in church function and a challenge to the authority of church leaders. In contrast, "New Licht" Calvinists practiced a more moderate interpretation of Calvinist theology that promoted rational inquiry and the betterment of mankind through an emphasis on practical morality and human reason. This doctrine was heavily influenced by the humanist threads of the Scottish Enlightenment that began to pervade the university system of Scotland, and that came to the Kirk via clerical pluralism. This was due to the fact that the lack of income produced by either a university professorship or a ministerial appointment was insufficient to provide a living, and often led to instances of ministers holding professorships and vice versa, the only type of dual appointment allowed by the Church of Scotland (Brown 265-266). Additionally, New Licht ministers supported the practice of patronage as a way of populating the Kirk hierarchy with ministers who exemplified a newly educated, gentlemanly face of the Scottish nation (another advantage of having close ties to the universities), as opposed to the prevalent stereotype of the barbaric, uneducated, superstitious provincial that tainted Scotland's reputation in the English eye.

"The Heaven-Taught Ploughman": Biography and Critical Scholarship

This century-long conflict contextualizes the life and work of Scotland's most famous poet, Robert Burns. For Burns, his upbringing and religious education was grounded firmly in the more liberal, New Licht style doctrine, as evidenced by the pamphlet William Burns wrote for his own

children, *A Manual of Religious Belief in a Dialogue Between Father and Son* (McGinty 3). This religious instruction from his father combined with Burns's own independent studies, including Locke, Smith and Thomas Reid, a proponent of Scottish Enlightenment "Common Sense" (McGinty 32) to develop what McGinty identifies as "a full appreciation of the value of religion and a feeling of revulsion at some of those who claimed to practice it in that their irrational beliefs and inhumane conduct seemed at odds with all he found good in it" (2). Burns's religious satires, therefore, take aim at the major offenders of "Common Sense" and compassion as these concepts came to be understood by New Licht Believers through the Scottish Enlightenment. Burns's primary critique of Auld Licht ministers is in their insistence upon interpreting scripture literally as well as independently of context, a method of reading in which Biblical references can be used in a "theology that has apparently left all reason and compassion behind in its logical pursuit of its own doubtful premises" (McGinty 39). However, although the majority of Burns's satires, such as "Holy Willie's Prayer," "Holy Fair," and "The Holy Tulzie" attack the Scottish Kirk and prominent Kirk leaders, I argue that the intertwined nature of religion and politics in eighteenth-century Scotland ensures that his satires are at their heart inherently political in nature, a connection that gives emphasis to the satires' role in expressing the complexities of national identity within a tensely grafted state. Thus, I argue that Burns's satires attempt to negotiate a national identity influenced by both negative religious authorities and foreign influences that erode existing national character. At a time in which neither traditional Scottish nor English identity is wholly desirable, Burns's poems must find and promote a sense of identity that is acceptable to both.

From within Scotland, Burns reacts to a system that is effectively a "theocratic" majority that equates orthodoxy and patriotism. In the absence of clan-based nationalism, the Auld Licht emphasis on obedience to the church's authority becomes the new basis for patriotism in Scotland,

particularly as resistance to authority was regarded as descent into anarchy and sedition with the Jacobins (McGinty 153). In McGinty's analysis of William Peebles, the Auld Licht minister critiqued by Burns in *Holy Fair*, he points to Peebles's statement in *Burnomania* (1811) that "A Christian is a patriot, a lover of peace and good order" (qtd in McGinty 153). This statement, McGinty says, is evidence of a belief circulating since at least the late 1790s among a portion of the ministers of the time that religion provided a civilizing force that prevented anarchy, a principle that likely gained in importance as the century drew to a close, with mounting fear surrounding the French Revolution and the threat of invasion from France (McGinty 153).[13] Yet this patriotism is problematic because of the Auld Licht resistance to Patronage and the awarding of church placements. The result is an insular patriotism that is more Scottish than British, since it espouses loyalty to authority, yet rejects the authority of Britain itself in governing church matters. This insularity further reinforces the stereotype of Scotland as backward and superstitious. In contrast, Burns and the New Licht Calvinists represent a more integrated form of patriotism that ultimately seeks to forge a new national identity within the state of Great Britain. Burns resists orthodoxy due to his exposure to the Scottish Enlightenment theories of Common Sense promoted by Thomas Reid and his contemporaries. These theories help to bring Scotland in line with England by challenging this insular theocracy and creating a more moderate, liberal, humanist doctrine in its place.

On the other hand, Burns resists British rule because of the English stereotyping of the Scottish people as an insular, "barbaric" and war-like, a perception carried down from Celtic mythology and medieval Scottish epics that celebrated Scotch resistance to English colonization

[13] McGinty also cites *A Treatise on the Causes of Sedition* (1798) by James Wright, a friend of Peebles and fellow minister, in which he supports religious practice as the unifying force between government and citizens as well as God and citizen, and blames the current political climate, with its recent uprisings and ongoing threat of invasion from France, on "powerful causes of disaffection and sedition such as Jacobin Newspapers, speeches in opposition to the measures of government, and the doctrines of certain religious sectaries" (qtd in McGinty 153).

(Carruthers and McIlvanney, 3) and that had been reinforced by multiple Jacobite uprisings over the course of the past century, motivating continuing discrimination enacted against the Scottish by the English. Burns accomplishes this resistance by using not only the political principles learned through his exposure to Scottish Enlightenment thinkers, but also through elements of native Scottish culture that had been used by the English to discredit the Scottish people. Among these elements were Scots dialect, native folklore, and the figure of the bard. While his letters demonstrate a well-read and eloquent command of Standard English as well as a keen awareness of audience, Burns employs the Scots dialect as a tool of resistance in that he critiques English rule from within a supposedly inferior language: the sharper or more stinging the satire intended, the stronger the Scots dialect. This use of dialect demonstrates what Katie Trumpener identifies as the "intricate relationship between oral and written literatures" in Scotland as a "complicated linguistic identity" (73). As Trumpener asserts, "Effectively monolingual (standard English) in its intellectual and official writings, eighteenth-century Scotland remained bilingual in its speech (with large repertoires of poetry and song in Erse/Scots Gaelic and English) and trilingual (Erse, Scots, and standard English) in its literary life" (73). While this multilingualism remained acceptable within Scottish borders, in order to reach English audiences, many writers felt pressured to "anglicize their own pronunciation and to develop a stately prose style in a language not fully their own" (Trumpener 73).

Instead, Burns follows the example of his predecessor, Robert Fergusson, and embraces Scots dialect as a tool for subverting "a culture which insisted on adherence to linguistic propriety according to Anglocentric norms" (Crawford 1). In his extended examination of the literary relationship between Burns and Fergusson, Robert Crawford draws attention to the ways in which both poets use the Standard Habbie stanza (also called the Burns's stanza) and its inherent mixed tonality in order to mock or undermine accepted institutions (1-8). For Fergusson, this institution is

the Anglocentric university culture, while for Burns, the institution is the Kirk and its representative leaders. Fergusson in particular is marked by a wide range of language that incorporates an "insider's as well as an outsider's vocabulary and perceptions" (5), although Crawford stops at drawing connections between Fergusson's "To the Principal and Professors of the University of St. Andrews, on their Superb Treat to Dr. Samuel Johnson" and Burn's poem "To a Haggis" based on this insider/outsider linguistic play. However, this appropriation of linguistic norms bears examination in Burn's satires against the Kirk and later his satire against George III, as Burns moves from criticizing cultural authorities within Scotland to attacking English political institutions using this same strategy. This shift in scope from local, Scottish issues to a national scene demonstrates the ability of the Scottish people, and in particular the power of the Scottish vernacular, to participate in larger national debates, thereby opening up the definition of nationalism, moving Scotland from the political and cultural insularity suggested by the Auld Licht definitions of "patriotism" to a wider, more ambitious concept of "nationality" that embraces Scotland's role in the United Kingdom.

"So vile a bustle"[14]: Burns's First religious satires

Burns's earliest satiric endeavors are primarily focused on his disagreements with the practices of the Scottish Kirk, particularly Orthodox Calvinism and what he sees as its austere, compassionless teachings. Among these earliest poems are the stinging satires, *The Twa Herds* (also known as *The Holy Tulzie*) and *Holy Willie's Prayer*, both of which demonstrate the ongoing theological battle between Auld Licht and New Licht denominations. Although the poems were

[14] "The Twa Herds", l14

circulated privately to much amusement, neither were included in Burns's first published edition, as they targeted prominent local Auld Licht ministers such as Alexander Moodie and John Russell and a parish elder, Willie Fisher, and had already drawn the attentions of the local Kirk Session who declaimed the works as acts of disobedience against the church. In both poems, Burns attacks doctrine such as Predestination and Original Sin, as well as the Auld Licht opposition to Patronage, but does so from the persona of an Auld Licht believer, creating an overall ironic representation of their beliefs. The first of these poems, *The Twa Herds*, which Burns described as "The first of my poetic offspring" (Burns qtd in McIntyre 51), critiques the two local ministers, Moodie and Russell, for their public and vicious feud regarding church boundaries. Although both ministers cling to Calvinist Orthodoxy, Burns's poem argues for their poor representation of Christian values, and by extension the problems inherent in Orthodoxy, by juxtaposing the concept of the minister as shepherd with overall violent imagery.

In the persona of an Auld Licht believer, Burns first laments the outcry caused by the quarrel because of the ammunition it gives to the New Licht or Moderate congregations, while praising the overall talents of both ministers. These praises come in two-stanza pairs, yet there is a distinct change in tone between the first and second stanzas of each pair. Moodie, he says, "Nae poison'd soor Arminian stank / He let them taste" (27-28), while Russell "kend the Lord's sheep ilka tail, / O'er a' the height; / An' tell'd gin they were sick or hale / At the first sight" (39-42). These first descriptions present each minister as benevolent and concerned with their "flock," as Moodie protects his congregation from the "poison" of Arminian doctrine, as the Moderates' theology was often described, while Russell is concerned with their overall health and well-being. These benign descriptions, however, give way to images of violence in the second stanza of each pair. Burns says that "The Fulmart, Wil-cat, Brock, an' Tod / Weel kend his [Moodie's] voice thro' a' the wood / […]

An' [he] liked weel to shed their blood / An' sell their skin" (33-36). This list of predators, the polecat, wildcat, badger, and fox, represent dangers to the flock that a "Good Shepherd" must protect against. McGinty identifies these predators as the members of Moodie's own congregation who he must pursue "in order to confront them with their sin" (189); yet, in the context of the last stanza, these predators are just as likely to be the New Licht Calvinists rising up against Orthodoxy. The last lines of the stanza effectively turn Moodie from shepherd to hunter, emphasizing the overall violence of his efforts to "protect" his flock. Likewise, Burns's description of Russell turns violent and unflattering:

> He fine a maingie sheep could scrub,
> Or nobly swing the Gospel-club;
> Or New-Light Herds could nicely drub
> And pay their skin;
> Or hing them o'er the burning dub,
> Or shute them in. (43-48)

Here, Russell's target is unequivocally the New Licht Calvinists, but his response, like Moodie's, to theological difference is bloodshed and condemnation. Specifically, Russell imagines them being flogged or hanging over a pit of fire, a rather obvious analogy for wishing them to Hell, a sentiment echoed by the speaker who says that "I trust in Heaven to see them het / Yet in a flame" (65-66). He then proceeds to name a series of New Licht ministers while wishing on them similar treatment. The satire ends by declaring that "Orthodoxy may yet prance" (91) while Learning and Common Sense, two of the key tenets of New Licht doctrine, are hanged and banished, respectively, further signaling the ministers' hostility toward Moderate theology.

This hostility is also present in the pervasive animal imagery throughout the satire, giving rise to the perception that Auld Licht believers are savage or uncivil in nature, playing into the stereotype of the Scottish people as brutes or barbarians. As McGinty observes, animalistic metaphors saturate the poem and he significantly points to the word "brute" as one of the terms used to describe parishioners (188). However, McGinty leaves the word as a mere example rather than teasing out the specific implications of Burns's diction. When combined with the overall violent tone of the poem, "brute" is also suggestive of the "brutal" nature of Orthodoxy, particularly as it is applied by these ministers, a practice that would seem to confirm the English stereotypes of the Scottish people as savage and uncivilized, particularly since they seem to apply such callousness against their own people. Additionally, the violence ascribed to both ministers throughout the poem stands in stark contrast to their role as shepherd and to the concept of a benevolent God in which Burns believed (McGinty 190). The animosity toward New Licht shown by the ministers carries over into their flock, as the speaker's hostility mirrors that of Moodie and Russell. Such mirroring is displayed in *Holy Willie's Prayer* as well, emphasizing the trickledown effect of the ministers' actions. In *Holy Willie's Prayer,* the speaker exalts himself as "a chosen sample, / To show thy grace is great and ample" (25-26), yet this grace is only extended to members of the Auld Licht congregations, and specifically denied to New Licht believers or to the speaker's enemies, like Gavin Hamilton. The speaker, a church elder, holds himself out as "A guide, a ruler and example / To a' Thy flock" (29-30), as Burns argues the ways in which church leaders model behavior for their parishioners.

Yet in these two satires, the behavior being modeled is decidedly un-Christian and damaging. Holy Willie is in fact a hypocrite, railing against drinking, swearing, dancing, and singing in general (32-33), and defaming Hamilton specifically for drinking, swearing and gambling (68),

while also committing the sins of lust and drunkenness himself (43-54). He blames Hamilton and others like him for turning the congregation away from God (71-72) and for shaming church leaders, while downplaying his own sinful nature as merely a test of his faith and a way to keep himself from being "owre proud […] / That he's sae gifted" (55-58), demonstrating Willie's false humility and the very sin he claims to be avoiding. Just as the speaker at the end of *The Twa Herds* wished destruction upon the New Licht believers, Holy Willie wishes destruction on Hamilton and his attorney, Robert Aiken, and the Presbytry of Ayr. Three times in the latter half of the poem, Willie commands or prays that harm will come to his enemies, creating the image of God as vengeful and destructive. Carol McGuirk asserts that the "absurdity" of Willie's quest for retribution "is the driving force behind his vindictiveness" that makes him "seem more comical than evil" (30), yet this "comic" description overlooks the threat of violence that overhangs the entire poem. McGinty describes Holy Willie's version of faith as "unexamined" (191) and that denies the theme of charity expounded throughout the New Testament in favor of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, "which if applied rigorously and driven without mercy to their conclusion, could result in the travesty of Christian faith as displayed by Holy Willie" (191). Instead of a benevolent, merciful God, Willie's inability to question his faith results in an image of God that is a reflection of Willie's own personality, one that is vengeful and full of spite.

Together, these poems present the view of Orthodox doctrine as fierce and unforgiving in nature, a religion stripped of compassion and mercy and one that fits the stereotype of the Scottish people as brutal, superstitious, and uncivilized. However, Burns's poem specifically transfers this stereotype onto the Auld Licht sect, creating a shift in power in which the negative aspects of Scottish identity are reassigned and attributed to the group that Burns is criticizing. As Crawford Gribben describes, "In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, many Scots refused to

believe that their religious faith should be or was being impacted by wider cultural change" (115). Gribben's assessment refers specifically to the public competition between Orthodox or Evangelical Calvinism and Moderate theology and their "recruitment" of new believers, but his statement also applies in the broader, national sense as Scottish citizens sought acceptance and respectability within the English eye. Both changes, religious and cultural, can be attributed to the influence of the Scottish Enlightenment and its more rational, humanist approach to intellectual thought and religious piety. Given the intertwined relationship of religion and national identity, these shifts in theology and cultural identity suggest that, for Burns, driving out negative spiritual influences is a way of improving the national character.

Taking it public: Holy Fair in The Kilmarnock edition

Burns's first published volume, the Kilmarnock edition of *Poems Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect*, marks a decided shift in tone and audience from the poems first circulated among his peers and townsmen and Burns's most savage satires against the Kirk and its prominent leaders were omitted. Much of the religious satire is gone, and in fact, of Burns's religious satires, only *Holy Fair*, a satiric account of the large, open-air communion services held for the local communities, was included in the final volume; however, the structure and aim of the piece is decidedly different from *The Twa Herds* and *Holy Willie's Prayer*. In the both of the earlier satires, Burns took aim specifically at Revs. Moodie and Russell, and church elder, Willie Fisher, attacks that were more piercing for their specificity. While Burns continues to attack Russell and Moodie in *Holy Fair*, the nature of the assembly, calling ministers from the surrounding townships to give sermons over several days, enables Burns to spread his criticisms between biting observations of residents' general behavior and criticisms of several other local ministers, including at least one Moderate minister, George

Smith of Galson. This more diversified mockery imitated criticisms already circulating during Burns's day regarding the conduct of fair-goers, as McIntyre notes the publication of a pamphlet from the year of Burns's birth critiquing the "odd mixture of religion, sleep, drinking, courtship, and a confusion of sexes, ages, and characters" found at the "sacred assembly" (qtd in McIntyre 56). The diversity of satiric targets as well as the familiarity of the critiques may explain why *Holy Fair* was chosen for inclusion and the other works were not.

Whereas Burns certainly positions himself as the voice of his "rustic compeers," the Scotland Burns envisions is one that is an idealized Scotland, free from the seemingly totalitarian authority of the Scottish Kirk. *The Twa Herds, Holy Willie's Prayer,* and *Epistle to John Goldie*[15] satirize specific church members and particular incidents as well as the general church practices Burns found fault with, such as taking scripture out of context in order to justify particular views or interpreting scripture with an overly literal view (what Burns dubbed "Superstition"). Whereas Burns omitted these particular satires because of the possibility of angering his local audience, the specificity of the personages discussed and the incidents described also would serve little purpose for the wider audience a formally published volume would attract, an audience that would be unfamiliar with the underlying issues or the events described. Instead, Burns opts for the more generalized *Holy Fair*, in which the familiarity the narrator assumes with his local readers enables him to draw attention to these issues as an insider, while the more generalized aim of his satire allows a broader audience to see the stereotypical presentation of Calvinist doctrine. Burns's direct goal in the satire is to attack the ministers he finds guilty of committing acts of "superstition" and

[15] This poem is not discussed in this chapter, however, the general theme of the work is an attack, once a gain, on Auld Licht Calvinism and Rev. John Russel, in which Russel is called as "state-physician" (9) to care for Superstition and Orthodoxy. He blames "her" illness on John Goldie, the author of several books arguing against the beliefs of Original Sin and literal readings of the Bible, as these practices were exercised in the Auld Licht congregations.

hypocrisy, but his narrator also functions as a way of revealing the problems associated with Auld Licht doctrine for his local readers while dismantling the stereotypical view of the Scottish people for his broader audience. Burns accomplishes this by using sexual imagery and diction that paints Auld Licht practices as sterile, unnatural, and unsatisfying.

In this poem, Burns's narrator speaks in the first person, as did his speaker in *Holy Willie's Prayer* and *The Twa Herds*, but his position in this poem is that of an observer rather than an actual participant as the actions and behaviors of other fair attendees take precedence. Yet this position gives him stronger insight and understanding regarding the actions of the townspeople. This is established from the opening of the poem, when he meets SUPERSTITION, HYPOCRISY, and FUN on the way to the Fair, as he greets them as a participant in the activity and a fellow townsman, casting himself in the role of the average citizen subject to the cultural and religious authority of the Kirk. He describes his scenes from the perspective of a witness, but he is by no means enamored by the Kirk leaders or affected by the religious enthusiasm of the gathering, as the poem opens with the narrator surveying his fields rather than on his way to the fair. He also only agrees to put on his Sunday "sark" (47) after FUN persuades him to join her, an indication that he may have intended to neglect the Sabbath and avoid the fair altogether. This distance enables Burns's narrator to reveal or see the events with a different perspective and more acute senses, yet one influenced by FUN as she agrees to be his companion during the outing, an indication that these observations, while perceptive, will not be without a coloring of mockery and jest. The poem opens with an emphasis on sight as the speaker describes the day and the "three hizzies" (12) in rich detail, and in lines 1-11, the narrator references the act of sight three distinct times, with "view" (3), "glowr'd" (10) and "see" (11). Burns gives the narrator a keen sense of vision, but his emphasis on the appearance of

the three women, combined with the allegorical naming strategy, creates a speaker who also possesses a higher knowledge or understanding of what he sees.

Throughout the satire, Burns uses imagery and language to reflect the contrast between a supposedly holy occasion and the sexually charged energy behind the scenes. Much of Burns's sexual imagery, coming from the townspeople, exudes a sense of positivity. FUN, the third of the maidens the narrator meets is described in glowing tones: "light as onie lambie" (24), with a "bonie face" (30) and "laughin" (32). She takes the narrator "by the hands" (33), an act that initiates physical contact. She tells him "'Ye, for my sake, hae gi'en the feck / Of a' the *ten commandments* / A screed some day'" (34-36). While the allegorical tone of the characterization helps to establish the satire, the exchange between FUN and the narrator is one that suggests familiarity and intimacy, a tone that carries over to many of the scenes described in the poem, particularly in the closing stanzas. After the preaching has ended, he says "*cheese* an' *bread* frae women's laps / Was dealt about in lunches" (206), while the "*Guidwife*" (208) cuts chunks of cheese for "the auld *Guidmen*" (212) who loiter about among the women. Burns portrays the meal as a final courtship ceremony of the day and the food "from women's laps" in particular presents a sexual overtone to the exchange since the focus on the women's "laps" draws the reader's attention to the genital area. His tone is that of an observer, but his observations have the feel of the habitual, not the momentary, as in lines 217-225 when he says:

> Waesucks! For him that gets nae lass,
>
> Or lasses that hae naething!
>
> Sma' need has he to say a grace,
>
> Or melvie his braw claithing!
>
> O *Wives*, be mindfu', ance yourself,

How bonie lads ye wanted,

An' dinna for a *kebbuck-heel*

Let lasses be affronted

On sic a day!

The narrator's vision and awareness is bardic in the ways in which it transcends time and space, recognizing the repeating patterns of gathering, courtship, and marriage that come about through such exchanges. This stanza in particular closes with the line, "On sic a day!" as opposed to Burns's variations of "on *that* day" (emphasis mine) ending the stanzas directly preceding and directly after, suggesting that there have been and will continue to be many occasions like this. His final stanza seals the courtship theme when he says that "monie jobs that day begin, / May end in *Houghmagandie* (sexual intercourse) / Some ither day" (241-243), a clear line of progression between the day's events and eventual consummation. The feeling of repetition, habit, and ritual associated with these passages contributes to an overall impression of fruitfulness and continuation, just as the bread and cheese from women's laps suggests nourishment from sexual exchanges.

The contrast to these representations of positive sexuality lie in Burns's depictions of religious enthusiasm and fundamentalist Calvinist doctrine, a contrast that ultimately creates an image of Orthodoxy as cold(hearted) and sterile. Burns establishes this differing set of imagery with FUN's companions, SUPERSTITION and HYPOCRISY, the personifications of Burns's key arguments against Auld Licht doctrine. In contrast to the brightness of FUN and the lively sexual imagery throughout the poem, SUPERSTITION and HYPOCRISY wear black (14-15), and "Their visage [is] – wither'd, lang an' thin, / An' sour as onie slaes" (21-22). The description of figures who are past their prime, old, withered, and lacking in sexual appeal or any residual sexual vitality are a notable

contrast to the "Guidwife" and "auld Guidmen" as well as the younger participants in the Fair. This juxtaposition of old and young mirrors the troubled relationship between Auld and New Licht denominations, as the Auld Licht believers and their doctrine are symbolized by the two older women, signifying the ways in which Orthodoxy is past its prime and withering away in the face of the younger generation. On the other hand, the New Licht denominations are embodied in the free and welcoming conduct of the younger generation, symbolizing the ways in which Moderate theology offers the potential for growth, change, and continuity. Later in the poem, as the ministers begin to preach, Burns specifically says of Rev. William Moodie that his sermons could "fire the heart devout, / Like cantharidian plaisters" (115-116). The cantharidian plaisters, a poultice made from the aphrodisiac Spanish Fly, reflect the ways in which Moodie's oratory creates and unnatural enthusiasm for hell-fire sermons and the lack of natural empathy or mercy caused by the callous judgmentalism of Auld Licht Calvinism with which Burns took issue. However, the particular use of this simile also suggests a sexual vitality that must then be awakened via artificial means. In this, Burns implies that the hyper-critical behavior of the Kirk, as well as the doctrinal practices Burns categorizes under hypocrisy and superstition, creates a sexually and culturally repressive environment among the Scottish people, leading to a culture that is unfruitful, withered, and slowly dying. Burns's contrast indicates the ways in which Auld Licht doctrine must be overcome if Scottish culture is to survive and move forward.

While a great deal of Burns's satire focuses on the sexual adventures of the fair-goers, Burns's discussion of the various ministers also repeats the arguments made in *The Twa Herds* and *Holy Willie's Prayer* that Auld Licht doctrine is in general cold and unforgiving, as well as violent in nature. Throughout the poem, he critiques ministers such as the Reverend George Smith of Galson, the Reverend William Peebles of Newton upon Ayr, and Reverend Alexander Miller of Mauchline.

However, his severest criticisms are saved for Russel and Moodie, who's sermons bookend the sermon "competition." Smith is actually identified as a New Licht minister, but one who preaches in the "English style, an' gesture fine" (129), a description that seems to identify Smith's Moderate beliefs with English/foreign influence rather than Scottish tradition. These manners, however, fail to hold his audience's attention. Likewise, Miller is described as a theological moderate, but one who is aware enough to know that his audience would be unreceptive, so "cannily he hums them" (150). Peebles is summarily dismissed as having sent common sense away (142). In the remaining descriptions, however, he also adds an extra element of performance as Burns describes for his audience the visual effects of the sermons more so than their content. He characterizes Moodie's sermon as frightening in its display, stating that "The vera sight o' Moodie's face" (106) would have sent the Devil running with fear, while the sermon itself is something of an energetic performance:

> Hear how he clears the points o' Faith
> Wi' rattlin and thumpin!
> Now meekly calm, now wild in Wrath,
> He's stampan, an' he's jumpan!
> His lengthen'd chin, his turn'd-up snout,
> His eldritch squeal an' gestures (109-114).

The emphasis on physical movement in this description zeros in on the stomping, jumping, and thumping of Moodie's actions, all behaviors that suggest a violent, rather than impassioned, sermon, especially when these actions are combined with the fearful visage Burns describes in the previous stanza. McGinty asserts that these energetic descriptions mimic the style of the medieval "brawl" poem in that the various sermons "[turn] out to be almost a preaching contest, as each of the preachers, in turn, battle for the attention of the crowd" (207), yet this battle for attention

results in "histrionics" (McGinty 207). That Burns would base his satire on a medieval "brawl" poem, a form in which acts of violence take precedence, emphasizes the suggested intensity and even hostility of Moodie's sermons.

Burns's description of John Russel's sermon indicates a lack of apparent athleticism compared to Moodie's preaching, yet the account is equally damning as he describes Russell's voice as "The Lord's ain trumpet" (181) while his words are "piercin […], like Highlan' swords / [that] divide the joints and marrow" (185-186). The sermon itself focuses on explicit imagery of Hell, with its "ragin flame, an' scorchin heat" (192). The metaphor of swords hearkens back to the violence expressed by Burns's speaker in both *The Twa Herds* and *Holy Willie's Prayer*, while the hellfire and brimstone of the sermon recalls the speakers of the previous poems consigning his enemies to eternal fire. Yet the phrase "joints and marrow" carries several significant meanings within the passage. McGinty asserts that Burns's reference to "marrow" alludes to *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* (1646) by Edward Fisher, that "[encourages] an antinomian stance, whereby the elect could sin and still be assured of salvation" (210). This theological point was ultimately banned as heresy, but is suggested in the misguided prayers of Holy Willie as well as the "grace-proud faces" (87) of some of the fair attendees. Yet McGinty overlooks that the phrase is a direct quote from Hebrews 4:12, that states that the "Word of *God* is a two-edged sword" (emphasis mine), whereas in Burns's satire, the words belong to Russel. The implication here is that the "black theology" (McGinty 210) of Russel's Auld Licht beliefs actually divide his followers from God, particularly in the hostility and lack of mercy shown toward others. However, the image of dismemberment is also one of three significantly war-like details throughout the stanza that amplify the effect of a "brawl" poem into the image of a brutal battle scene, the others being the comparison of Russel's voice to a trumpet and the images of swords. The mention of "Highlan' swords" specifically evokes the memory of

multiple Highland uprisings within the eighteenth century, the last in 1745 that ended with the calamitous Battle of Colloden. These images recall both the stereotypes of violent Highland clansmen in rebellion, as well as the resultant Highland clearances and other English methods of retaliation against the insurgents. Yet the negative stereotypes are transposed onto the Auld Licht minister as a demonstration of the overall cultural, religious, and intellectual damage Orthodoxy exerts on the Scottish people. Given the tendency of Orthodox ministers such as William Peebles to equate impiety and rebellion against the Kirk with treason against the state (McGinty 153), Burns effectively flips the table on Auld Licht believers and paints *them* as the insurgents endangering the Scottish nation with their callous theology.

The "humble Bardie": Burns's political satires in the Kilmarnock Edition

Although *Holy Fair* was the only clerical satire included in the Kilmarnock edition, its length and thoroughness enable Burns to effectively summarize his complaints with Auld Licht doctrine and the Kirk of Scotland. His inclusion of the Moderate Calvinist minister, George Smith, however, offers a brief window into Burns's problems with, not New Licht theology, but English rule of Scotland and an ongoing pattern of Anglicization. In *Holy Fair*, Burns says that Smith preaches with an "English style, an' gesture fine" (129) and references the influence of Socrates or Antonine on his presentation (131). While Burns's speaker comments ironically, voicing the audience's perceived dislike of Smith, his remarks serve to highlight the apparent influence of English educational authority on Scottish culture, as both the style of oratory and the influence of the classics exemplifies an Anglicized education. This slight reference is more dominant in the secular satires, *The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer* and *A Dream*, included in the Kilmarnock edition. Burns first broaches this line of complaint in his preface, which, as Ian McIntyre describes, "was a cross between a manifesto and a sales-pitch and it began with what could be

mistaken for a modest disclaimer" (79), although Burns also manages to turn this disclaimer to his advantage. This "disclaimer" is the statement that "the following trifles are not the production of the Poet, who, with all the advantages of learned art, and perhaps amid the elegancies and idleness of upper life, looks down for a rural theme with an eye to Theocrites or Virgil" (Burns, 3). This so-called disclaimer is more of a commonality of late eighteenth-century publishing rather than an actual apology, since, as McIntyre notes, Burns's letter to [Dr John Moore] indicates that he "had a shrewd idea of the merit of his work" (81). This disclaimer does, however, set Burns apart from his more traditionally educated fellow authors, while also implying that a classical education is a luxury open to the "elegancies and idleness of upper life," in other words, the domain of the wealthy, English aristocrats. Instead, this preface sealed the reputation/persona of the "Heaven-taught plowman" as Burns would be called by reviewers such as Henry McKenzie.

This persona, however, was a myth carefully cultivated by Burns for maximum public appeal. The nature of education in Scotland during the mid- to late- eighteenth century ensured nearly universal literacy. Yet Burns possessed a greater depth and quality of education than many of his peers, having had the advantage of a private tutor hired by his father (Leask, "Robert Burns", 72), in addition to undertaking independent reading of prominent thinkers of the Scottish Enlightenment such as Smith and Hume. Yet, the overall tone of academic and literary discussion conformed to "Anglocentric norms" exemplified by literary theorists such as Adam Smith and Hugh Blair (Crawford 1). In his preface, Burns takes aim at this privileging of Anglicized speech and literature by drawing a distinction between the English "Poet" and the Scottish "Bard." The first way in which he delineates this difference is by invoking the memory of his predecessor, Robert Fergusson. Although Fergusson had been educated at the University of St. Andrews, for Burns, Fergusson stands as an example of a "potent vernacular resistance to Anglocentric, high academic

literary culture" (Crawford 7) through Fergusson's deliberate combination of standard English and Scots, as well as his use of the Scottish traditional Habbie Stanza, that Burns would adopt as a primary mode. Even though Burns recognizes Fergusson as a brother author and a literary forefather, Burns's use of appellations in this passage is strategic in order to outline differences between himself and Fergusson based on Fergusson's formal education. Returning to Burns's opening statement that the collection is "not the production of the Poet, […] with all the advantages of learned art," Burns clearly aligns the title "Poet" with the English, Augustan tradition that took its roots from classical Greek and Roman literature, and places himself squarely outside of that tradition by saying that he is "unacquainted with the necessary requisites for commencing Poet by Rule" (3). His lack of education, according to these Anglicized standards, denies him the title of "Poet" specifically, even though later in the passage, Burns feels comfortable labeling Fergusson as a "Scotch Poet" (4), not merely a "Poet", acknowledging Fergusson's combined use of the Scottish traditional modes and the English.

Instead, throughout the remainder of the passage, Burns refers to himself as a "Rhymer," "Author," and "nameless Bard," carefully avoiding the term "Poet" for himself. One may say that the avoidance of this term, a designation that is seemingly elevated in status, is merely another example of the false humility expressed in the early lines of the Preface, especially when he says that others may label him as an "'impertinent blockhead" because he "'looks upon himself as a Poet of no small consequence'" for publishing (4). Yet Burns feels comfortable claiming for himself the title of "Bard," the traditional voice of Scottish historical pride, a figure of high regard for their social and cultural importance. He says that without a classical education, he "sings the sentiments and manners he felt and saw in himself and his rustic compeers around him, in his and their native language" (3). With this statement, Burns marks himself as the voice of his countrymen, taking up

both the poetic and socio-cultural functions of the original Bard, by recording not only the "native language" of the Scottish people, but also their "sentiments and manners". By reviving the figure of the Bard, Burns underscores the ways in which the Scottish are either excluded from literary and academic culture or forced to adopt a false identity of Anglicized language in order to be recognized. The Bard, however, with his history as a traveling minstrel, and Burns's statement that the bard will "sing", creates the illusion of a literary identity that is based on performance of a long-standing role. This performance is particularly noteworthy given the ways in which Burns also critiques elements of native Scottish culture, particularly the prominence of conservative Calvinist ideology and its effects on every-day life.

Throughout the volume, Burns adopts the persona of the "humble Bardie," particularly in poems such as *Scotch Drink, The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer*, and *A Dream*, examples of secular or political satires aimed at English rule. Leask argues that Burns's adoption of the "humble Bardie" persona is a localism that "[parodies] the grandiose claims of the Ossianic Bard" ("Robert Burns," 74), yet the content and the placement of these particular poems in the Kilmarnock edition suggest a greater purpose in using the diminutive form and his shifting use of appellations between these and other early poems in the collection is worth noting. Burns opens the volume with the brief poem "Nature's Art," which reiterates the separation between the educated, Anglicized Poet and the "Simple Bard, unbroke by rules of Art" (1) that Burns had established in his preface. The "humble bardie" appears two poems later in the more lighthearted *Scottish Drink* and *The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer*, poems that (respectively) celebrate the vital role of whiskey in the Scottish culture and economy and criticize the Walsh Act (1784)[16] and the parliamentarians responsible. The

[16] This was intended to "prevent what [the English] considered preferential treatment to the Scottish distilling industry," and that "had not only severe effects on the Scottish whisky industry but was in breach of the terms of

next major poem in this sequence is the religious satire, *Holy Fair*, in which Burns does not identify himself by any title, merely as a participant in the local festivities. Then, several poems later, Burns returns to the "humble bardie" in *A Dream*. In the second and third poems, the "humble bardie" is representative of the typical Scotsman, yet as a bard, he is keenly aware of issues of national importance. According to Katie Trumpener in *Bardic Nationalism*:

> Responding in particular to Enlightenment dismissals of Gaelic oral traditions, Irish and Scottish antiquaries reconceive national history and literary history under the sign of the bard. According to their theories, bardic performance binds the nation together across time and across social divides; it reanimates a national landscape made desolate first by conquest and then by modernization, infusing it with national memory. (xii)

In this instance, the "national landscape" is one that transcends Scotland and takes the bard to English soil in order to demonstrate the Scottish culture's relevance within a larger national fabric. The "humble bardie" is a figure who can move across geographic boundaries to bring the voice of the rustic Scotsman into a wider world, drawing and then holding the attention of Anglo-centric political discussions to shift attention onto Scottish concerns. Burns's "humble bardie" acts as an advocate for the rustic local by systematically revealing English injustices against the Scottish people. This demanding and commanding of attention is accomplished through the "humble bardie's" use of Scots vernacular to address political leaders and government figureheads, a strategy Burns employs in *The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer* and *A Dream*.

---

the Union and, for Burns, another symptom of the London Parliament's, at best, indifference to Scottish needs" (Noble and Hogg, 25)

Starting with *The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer*, Burns uses both the neutral appellation of "author" in the title, and later claims the title of a "simple Bardie" (5). This title simultaneously exudes the persona of the heaven-taught ploughman, while also capitalizing on a sense of false modesty. The "Bardie," while "simple," is confident enough to address the forty-five Scottish representatives at Westminster in the first line of the satire in response to the Wash Act of 1784. The act increased vigilance against illegal whiskey stills, increased taxes on legal stills (Crawford 93), and reduced excise duties on Scottish whiskey, "ending the favorable treatment which Scottish distillers were alleged to enjoy under the excise laws" (McIntyre 63).[17] Throughout the poem, Burns attacks the Wash Act and its negative impact on Scotland, both financially and culturally, upholding the necessity of the whiskey trade as a Scottish institution.[18] He refers to these increased sanctions as a "great affliction" (14) that would seemingly halt whiskey production and distribution across the country, as seen through Burns's frequent references to Scotland being "dry" or having empty cups or pots, an image in which the empty cup becomes symbolic of financial hardship. Burns puts forth that such social and economic harm rises to the level of a national emergency, one worthy of protest, as he calls on the representatives to "tell them wi' a patriot-heat, / Ye winna bear it" (65-66) and declares that "There's some *sark-necks* I wad *draw* tight" (59). This last declaration, buried in between calls to the MPs to protest the restrictions, flirts with sedition in its threat of violence carried on the image of hanging or strangulation.

[17] The Walsh Act drew an official line between Highland and Lowland Scotland for the purpose of imposing different rates of excise tax on whiskey. The Highlands were taxed at a lower rate in order to promote more *legal* distillation, as opposed to illegal. The amount of Lowland whiskey produced to combat the tax created the reputation of Lowland whiskey as sub-par, and only fit for use as Gin, which then cut into the English market on Gin. The harm to the English gin trade resulted in the repeal and replacement of the restrictions in 1786 (Dietz (1997) and Stewart, Russell, and Anstruther, 2).

[18] This line of reasoning is first established in the poem, "Scotch Drink," where Burns celebrates the influence of whiskey as a relief to daily life, a creative fuel, and social lubricant.

Burns's imagery of patriotic violence, however, carries little weight. Crawford calls the poem a "cheerful mock-heroic" that is part of "an established tradition of impertinence" (92), and explains that by the time of publication, the Wash Act had already been replaced with more favorable legislation. While Burns's poem may have lost some of its political bite, it does, however, use several poetic techniques and images to construct or reconstruct a national identity that defies Anglicization. These rhetorical strategies focus on the personification of a specifically Scottish Muse, as well as the personification of Scotland itself as an "auld Mither" (187), both of which play with the conventions of the Anglo-centric poetic tradition. After addressing the Scottish representatives, Burns declares:

> Alas! My roupet *Muse* is hearse!
> Your Honors' hearts wi' grief 'twad pierce,
> To see her sittan on her arse
> Low i' the dust
> An scriechan out prosaic verse,
> An' like to brust! (7-12).

This image of the muse stands in stark contrast to the refined Muse of Augustan tradition and presents a specifically Scottish persona that captures many of the stereotypical aspects of Scottish identity. The muse is "hearse"/hoarse and "scriechan," a fitting description given the Scottish outcry against English regulation, with the implication that protesters will grow hoarse before their concerns are heard. Yet the specific focus on tone of voice is also suggestive of the linguistic differences between England and Scotland and the English bias against Scottish dialect and pronunciation. Despite demonstrating a facility with standard English, the language of government and academic discourse, in his letters and preface, Burns addresses the MPs and casts his Muse as

speaking in Scots dialect. This use of dialect combines with the image of the Muse "sittan on her arse / Low i' the dust" to emphasize the ways in which Burns speaks for the common Scottish individual rather than the educated gentleman who likely already conforms to the Anglo-centric ideals of dialect and rhetoric. In this sense, the "humble" Muse mirrors the "humble Bardie" of the opening stanza. Burns's muse also recites "prosaic" verse, implying either unimaginative or unoriginal thought, or possibly prose rather than metered verse. The implied lack of originality could be attributed to the dearth of whiskey and the absence of its inspiring qualities, while the "prosaic" verse could also be symbolic of the spoken complaints of the people. In either case, Burns's Muse is symbolic of the ways in which he speaks for the common Scottish individual.

Burns's appeal in this verse is also significant, as he declares that "Your Honors' hearts wi' grief 'twad pierce," a direct address intended to solicit sympathy for the personified Muse individually, but by extension, for the Scottish nation as a whole. This verse stands in contrast to his brief censure of the MPs, when he says that "In gath'rin votes you were na slack" (31), implying that the representatives are quick to act in their own favor, and should, by extension, act in the interests of their constituents. He continues this theme throughout the poem as he emphasizes the "great affliction" these regulations have caused, as well as the sympathy demanded for the "auld Mither," another personification of Scotland, while urging his audience to action. He presents an image of Scotland as a weeping mother, similar to the image of the old woman of the *aisling* tradition used by Thomas Moore. Burns's "Mother Scotland" is vulnerable to greedy excise men (39) and smugglers (44), both of whom would "[pick] her pouch as bare as Winter" (47), leaving Scotland impoverished and shamed. Thus, the regulations that would leave Scotland "plundered" (53), are, according to Burns, essentially legalized robbery under English law. He makes a last sympathetic appeal by imagining Scotland as a weeping wife (62), before calling certain individual

representatives by name and hypothetically predicting their willingness to fight in defense of Scottish interests. This naming and call to action is again an attempt to shame or guilt the representatives into acting on Scotland's behalf, by reminding them of their Scottish loyalties and, admittedly warlike nature. In Burns's previous clerical satires, references to violence and warfare are couched in negative terms and used to represent the aggressive tendencies of Orthodox Calvinism. Here, however, violence is represented positively due to two factors: violence is portrayed as necessary for the defense and betterment of Scotland, and violence is hypothetically enacted by the Lords and representatives responsible for that defense.

Burns again uses the persona of the "humble Bardie" in the poem *A Dream*, a satiric birthday ode mocking George III. The poem is not only a parody of traditional poetic practice in creating celebratory odes, but also a subversive attempt to demonstrate the ability of the Scottish vernacular to participate in national debate. Burns uses a dialect that is systematically marginalized and dismissed as undesirable, uneducated, and inferior to undercut Anglo-centric political and literary norms by revealing the political and cultural flaws of the parent kingdom. This dialect enhances the persona of the "heaven taught ploughman," which enables Burns to play both the cutting political critic and the rustic simpleton. Yet Burns recognized that he stood on dangerous ground, both professionally and politically. He opens the poem with the epigram: "Thoughts, words, and deeds, the Statute blames with reason; But surely *Dreams* were ne'er indicted Treason" (56), which Crawford notes "adapts a well-known cynical rhyme from the long history of political controversy" (93). In this poem, the "treason" suggested by the epigram is more serious than the mere disobedience to the Kirk suggested criticized by Rev. Peebles and closer to actual seditious speech aimed at George III and his family, even though seditious writings would not be covered as

treason until the Seditious Practices Act of 1795.[19] Nonetheless, friends such as Frances Dunlop, whom Burns had taken into confidence as a literary advisor, counseled against including *A Dream*, as the political slant of the piece would alienate and antagonize a wider English audience, thereby damaging sales (Noble and Hogg 60). He responded by saying that, "I set as little by kings, lords, clergy, critics, &c as all these respectable Gentry do by my Bardship" (qtd in Noble and Hogg 60). His response effectively summarizes two main issues within Burns's writing: the class and cultural differences between Burns and the persons being criticized (such as the Scottish representatives in *The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer*), and their equal disregard for his authority as a Scottish voice of the people, or in fact, their large disregard of the Scottish people in general.

In the poem, Burns openly mocks the celebratory odes of English bards and draws attention to his "uncouth" participation in the event, an overt attempt to emphasize the exclusion of Scottish poets and writers from mainstream English literature. In the opening stanza, Burns declares:

> Guid-Mornin to your Majesty!
> May Heaven augment your blisses,
> On ev'ry new *Birth-day* ye see,
> A humble Bardie wishes!
> My Bardship here, at your Levee,
> On sic a day as this is,
> Is sure an uncouth sight to see,
> Amang the Birth-day dresses
> Sae fine this day. (1-9)

[19] At the time of publication, treason was covered under the Sedition Act of 1661, not the later Seditious Practices Act of 1795 that applied during the publication of Thomas Moore's works and specifically made published speech and literary works vulnerable to prosecution.

The "humble bardie" is again contrasted with the "Poets" (14) of the second stanza "wi' rhymes weel-turne'd an' ready" (15), a remark on the base flattery of the English "Poets" and Anglo-centric verse typically produced in honor of such occasions. This observation not only suggests the perceived intellectual and cultural inferiority of Scottish authors and verse in comparison to the English writers and the Anglo-centric tradition, but also signals the difference in perspective produced from within such a marginalized culture as Scotland. As a result of this contrast, Burns's Bard is revived as not only the voice of the common Scottish people, but also as a truth teller, a revealer, and a moral compass. He says that "The *Poets*, too, a venal gang, / […] / Wad gar you trow ye ne'er do wrang" (emphasis his, 14-16), suggesting not only the mercenary or profit-driven motives of English poets, but also their willingness to gloss over the King's faults in an effort to provide a pleasing product. Burns's italics on *Poets*, as well as "*lord* an' *lady*" (11) implies an apparent English superiority as the poets are grouped visually and typographically with the aristocracy, yet the use of italics also gives the gloss of sarcasm, as if Burns is questioning both the superiority of the English, as well as the actual poetic talents of the writers due to their bribability.

This theme is sustained throughout the next few stanzas, as Burns continues his own brusque criticism in spite of his alleged lack of skill, as he states in stanzas 3 and 4 that "before a Monarch's face, / Ev'n *there* I winna flatter" (19-20), and "'Tis very true, my sovereign King, / My skill may weel be doubted" (28-29). Such self-doubt is insincere, but plays well with the tone of the "humble Bardie" as it appears to offer a simplified, guileless perspective that clashes with the craftiness and corruptibility of the English. Burns offers a superficial attempt to mitigate his disapproval when he says that "There's monie *waur* [worse] been o' the Race, / And aiblins *ane* been better / Than You this day" (25-27); yet the "one better" is a backhanded compliment and an "undeveloped," or "awkward and irresolute" (Crawford 94) reference to Charles Stuart. This

reference revives the ghost of the Highland Rebellion and the Uprising of 1745, reminding the reader of the strained political relationship between Scotland and England. It is, in its underdevelopment, a memory raised only to be immediately suppressed,[20] a contextual hint at the illegitimacy of England's rule over Scotland and the subsequent repression of Scottish culture and language as retaliation for the uprising. This exemplifies the ongoing conflict between English and Scottish culture, particularly in the privileging of English literary tradition, as Crawford sees an apparent dis-ease in Burns's ability to function in certain arrangements: "[The poem's] literary self-consciousness seriously problematizes the roughness attaching to the figure and voice of the ploughman. Burns seems uneasy, and he never loses his unease, when the genre requires him to place himself in a high-life setting" (94). I would argue, however, that this uneasiness that Crawford identifies is intentional, rather than accidental discomfort, as it draws attention to the socio-economic and cultural differences between Burns and the government leaders he addresses mentioned throughout the satire. Burns's willingness to both face and employ this uneasiness in his favor demonstrates the ways in which Scottish dialect and culture is capable of participating in larger governmental debate, but has been prevented from doing so by cultural suppression and Anglicized supplanting.

In the next stanzas, Burns questions the King's intelligence as well as his trust in the administration (37-45), the rising taxes after the American Revolution (46-50), and the lavish spending in the face of financial crisis (55-63), giving clear reasons for his distrust of the current administration and rule, as well as demonstrating the rural inhabitant's knowledge of the wider world and the wider political situation. Such knowledge of government affairs belies the stereotype

[20] See discussion of the trial of John and Leigh Hunt for sedition as it is referenced in Thomas Moore's *Intercepted Letters*, particularly discussion of Letter III. (Chapter 2, p. 143-148).

of the ignorant rural farmer, even though Burns partially capitalizes on this same myth in the form of his "heaven-taught ploughman." Yet these critiques are mild compared to the criticisms levelled at the King's children. He closes his address to George III with the salute:

> Hail, *Majesty most Excellent!*
> While Nobles strive to please Ye,
> Will Ye accept a Compliment,
> A simple Bardie gies Ye?
> Thae bonie Bairntime, Heav'n has lent,
> Still higher may they heeze Ye
> In bliss, till Fate some day is sent,
> For ever to release Ye
> Frae Care that day. (73-81)

This stanza draws on two techniques used previously in the poem, italics for titles, suggesting that Burns's "*Majesty most Excellent*!" is a tongue-in-cheek acknowledgement, and the self-style "simple Bardie," significantly capitalized, to refer to himself. The combination of these two appellations in the stanza in effect reverses the status of the actors, as Burns designation claims the prestige of the bard in spite of his self-proclaimed humble origins, while the italics added to the King's greeting, particularly in light of the Stuart reference in line 26, essentially robs him of the respect typically due a monarch. Burns also congratulates George III on his children, and the line "still higher may they heeze Ye" would seem to imply that their achievements compliment the King, yet these "achievements" are all negative. Burns commences his severest criticisms on the Prince of Wales

(the future Prince Regent and George IV), Prince Frederick Augustus, Duke of York and Albany, and Prince William, (later William IV).[21]

All three sons are criticized for their scandalous affairs; however, Prince George in particular is called out for his extravagant spending. Burns declares that "Down Pleasure's stream, wi' swelling sails, I'm tauld ye're driving rarely" (84-85), a reference to the Prince's out-of-control spending, lavish lifestyle, and political ties to the radical Whig party.[22] The focus on finances, however, is criticism in keeping with the reproach to the King for the "spending fit" in honor of the birthday celebrations. Yet the Prince's spending appears to cause even more concern due to his potential to inherit the throne when Burns cautions that "some day ye ma gnaw your nails/ An' curse your folly sairly" (86-87). Although Burns acknowledges that "ye may doucely fill a Throne" (93), as heir, Prince George's behavior and spending is cause for concern. This warning is echoed in the final stanza of the poem addressed to the entire Hanovarian family, when he says:

> God bless you a'! consider now,
>
> Ye're unco muckle dautet [greatly fussed over];
>
> But ere the *course* o' life be through,
>
> It may be bitter sautet [salted] (127-130).

As a whole, Burns appears to care little for the English ruling family, yet his warnings indicate a keen understanding of the ongoing issues plaguing George III and his reign, as well as anticipating those of the future George IV. The "bitterness" referenced at the end of the poem recalls not only the aftermath of the American Revolution, but also looks forward to the financial issues looming under

[21] Burns also mentions George III's daughters, but his arguments here are more focused on sarcastic references to their beauty and ability to find husbands.

[22] Burns composed and published the poem in 1786. By this time, the Prince was secretly married to Maria Fitzherbert, and also deeply in debt. The Prince's debts created a personal financial crisis necessitating the first parliamentary grant to pay his bills, which was awarded in 1787.

George IV. His final stanza indicates the lack of respect and affection due the royal family, an ominous feeling given the political climate of growing unrest after the American Revolution and the potential for further uprisings, particularly if the economic situation were not to improve.

Burns's attacks on the royal family throughout *A Dream* are directed at each person separately, as he calls out George III and each of his oldest sons for their own crimes and failures. This insistence on individuality emphasizes the humanity of the people he criticizes, exposing their flaws *as* people, yet also removing the mysticism or unwavering respect typically due the King and his family, purely by virtue of royal birth. Burns also employs this sense of individuality in *The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer* when he names individual Scottish representatives. In both cases, Burns focuses on naming and identifying in order to strip away the trappings of title or political power and demonstrate an overlooked equality between English political actors and the Scottish people. These failings are also enumerated from within a literary and linguistic paradigm that had been, to that point, marginalized and discounted by the dominance of standard English as the language of government and power. Burns's ability to dismantle that power structure from within that marginalized literary pattern further erodes the cultural dominance assumed by the English.

The Edinburgh Edition

As previously stated, in the Dedication to the Edinburgh edition (1787) of Burns's poems, he tells the gentlemen of the Caledonian Hunt that "I come to claim the Scottish name with you." This statement bears the weight of confidence gained not only through the literary success of the previous edition, but also a confidence that comes from a clear sense of national identity claimed through religious and political arguments. In the Kilmarnock edition, Burns's satiric attacks on the King and government authorities established the ability of the Scottish vernacular to function as a

political statement on par with the standard English of formal government, while in the religious poem *Holy Fair*, Burns attacks the rigidity of Auld Licht Calvinism, particularly in the ways that Orthodoxy confirms the negative stereotypes associated with the Scottish. Between these two arguments, Burns reframes national identity in a more intellectually and spiritually progressive manner by rejecting both the outward assumptions of Scottishness and attempts to Anglicize Scottish culture, while also attempting to reform those internal issues that give rise to the negative views. This attempt is carried through to the satire, *Address to the Unco Guid, or The Rigidly Righteous*, one of many religious satires that were included in the Edinburgh edition. The satire focuses on one of the issues presented in the previous poems, *Holy Fair, The Twa Herds,* and *Holy Willie's Prayer*, that of the "grace-proud" Orthodox Calvinists mentioned in *Holy Fair* and their lack of compassion toward others.

However, the speaker and tone of the satire is markedly more straightforward than the previous poems as Burns directly addresses Auld Licht parishioners with an air of authority. He opens with an epigram that is a paraphrase of Ecclesiastes 7:16[23]:

> My Son, these maxims make a rule,
> An' lump them ay thegither:
> The Rigid Righteous is a fool,
> The Rigid Wise anither;
> The cleanest corn that e'er was dight
> May hae some pyles o' caff in;
> So ne'er a fellow-creature slight
> For random fits o' daffin.

[23] "Be not just to excess, and be not overwise. Why work your own ruin?"

The first words of the epigram, "My Son," set Burns up as an authority by capitalizing on the respect due an elder of the community, while also drawing on the perception of a father as a source of benevolent wisdom and good wishes. This fatherly persona is also the latest iteration of the Bardic persona developed throughout Burns's poems, as the speaker progresses from a parody of an Auld Licht believer in *The Twa Herds*, to the impartial observer in *Holy Fair*, to the "humble Bardie" of *A Dream.* Each iteration of the Bardic speaker gains more power and authority that enables Burns's father figure to address his audience directly. Yet the false humility of the "humble Bardie" directed at the English is dropped and replaced by a sense of genuine empathy and concern for the Scottish people. This transformation creates a more straightforward narrator who captures both the sense of a cultural insider and the voice of wisdom cultivated by his knowledge and experiences, while also functioning as a moral guide.

Equally important is the "Son" addressed by the epigram and the audience addressed in the body of the poem, as the narrator seeks to impart advice while correcting destructive behavior. The "Son" of the epigram is not accused of being one of these "Rigidly Righteous," but rather warned against falling into such uncharitable Christian folly, whereas the body of the poem is directly aimed at those guilty of being what Burns called "grace proud" in *Holy Fair*. The command of authority is compounded in the body of the satire as he cautions his readers to "Hear me, ye venerable Core / As counsel for poor mortals" (9-10), a statement that frames the narrator as an advocate for the accused and sinful. Yet the phrase "poor mortals," also implies the poem's audience, those who practice the "folly" of being too rigid in their views, a different, but equally severe sin in the form of pride, enjoining his audience to hold a mirror to their actions. Burns expands on the symbolism of the "cleanest corn" with "pyles o' caff" mentioned in the epigram, a reminder to the audience that no person is completely absolved of sin and that those who condemn others are equally likely to be condemned in turn. This tendency toward pride

is demonstrated in the unforgiving nature of Orthodox Calvinism and the punishments meted out through the Kirk Sessions, as he directly addresses the reader:

> O YE wha are sae guid yourself,
>
> Sae pious and sae holy,
>
> Ye've nought to do but mark and tell
>
> Your neebours' faults and folly! (1-4).

He treats their "Pharisaical" (Noble and Hogg 194) piety as mere gossip, fodder for personal amusement and self-aggrandizement, as if the people he's addressing revel in the misfortunes or misdeeds of others in order to elevate themselves, a repetition of the heresy encompassed in the *Marrow* doctrine. He also censures his audience for "that purity ye pride in" (22), while revealing that such "purity" is often an outward ruse for sins that are better "hidden" (24) than those of their fellow parishioners. In this approach, Burns seeks to encourage "humane principles of fraternity" (Crawford 127), by urging a more charitable Christian view, although Crawford notes what he sees as a mere "shadowy figure" of God and an absence of actual piety (127). In fact, Crawford's overall argument seems to question the presence of God in Burns's writings, or at least the presence of a "positive" religious expression in the place of Orthodoxy's rigidity, as he claims that Moderate theology is "essentially an Anglicised one, borrowing its pieties from the attenuated idioms of natural theology, Deism and Sentiment" (127).

Burns's goal, however, is rooting out the negative influences of Auld Licht doctrine that harm the Scottish people and their sense of national identity; an absence of piety or definitive religious expression is less important than the emphasis on fraternity, particularly as it relates to combating the erosive influences of Anglicization on Scottish nationalism and national identity. Not only does such pharisaical piety seemingly affirm the stereotype of the Scottish as uncharitable and hostile, but it also creates division and animosity between the Scottish people, an argument emphasized in Burns's previous poems, such as *The Twa Herds* and *Holy Willie's Prayer*, when the narrators summarily wish

their enemies, the New Licht Calvinists, to hell. Instead, Burns proceeds to build sympathy for the sinner, emphasizing the ways in which individuals are prone to "unthinking" behavior (34) or even "treachery" (46), but are seized by true regret for their transgressions (55-56). Simultaneously, he berates the "virtuous Dames" (41) for being "Ty'd up in godly laces" (42), a symbolic representation of their inflexibility and lack of compassion in their tendency to judge others' sexual transgressions. This metaphor also demonstrates the ways in which their beliefs are self-constricting and restrain growth and movement, a limitation that applies to national identity as well as the backward views expressed by Orthodox Calvinists, since their rejection of Moderate theology stands as a rejection of the intellectual, philosophical, and cultural changes occurring throughout Scotland.

Conclusion

In examining the rise of Burns as a national poet, Robert Crawford explores the conditions in which such a rise may be possible. He states that in the face of a colonizing power, "Regional nationalists of this kind may appear backward, intellectually simplistic, driven by emotion rather than reason, all the more because they tend to be bonded by a common religion, perhaps a local sect, and a language which also differs from that of their rulers" (103). Each of these assumptions presents an obstacle that the poet or author must overcome for himself and for his countrymen in order to gain respectability and autonomy within the nation of which they are a part. Burns's problem in this instance, however, is that he is fighting two different battles that simultaneously shape national identity both from within and without. Internally, Burns combats what he sees as the negative influence of Orthodox Calvinism, a religious doctrine steeped in "superstition" and a lack of empathy for sinners, both elements that in their practice would seemingly confirm the stereotypes of the Scottish people as ignorant and hostile. Externally, Burns battles against the Anglicizing of Scottish culture, primarily the ways in which English

literary forms and dialect supplant the Scottish vernacular as the language of government and intellectual and literary discussion. Burns overcomes this through the use of Scottish dialect in his poems, a demonstration of the ability of the Scottish vernacular to participate in the larger debates of government process, while also defying the accepted linguistic conventions that would seemingly exclude the vernacular from those debates. In doing so, Burns argues for a type of national identity that is prescriptive, not descriptive in nature, one that rejects the cold hostility of Auld Licht Calvinism while also resisting the erosion of Scottish culture in favor of the perceived superiority of English manners and diction to argue for a better definition of Scottishness.

These battles are exemplified in Burns's poems, as the clerical satires focus on eradicating or correcting the harmful influence of Calvinist Orthodoxy. Burns does this by targeting individual doctrines, such as what he calls "superstition," or taking Biblical verses out of context, the concept of the elect, a theological principle vulnerable to corruption by those who would seemingly glory in their own righteousness, or in targeting individual ministers or Kirk elders responsible for ministering to the public. The political satires, on the other hand, attack not only the legislation aimed at harming Scottish culture, but also the moral failings of the country's leaders. Burns attacks both sides within the framework of the Scottish vernacular by using a Bardic figure who is both a moral compass and a guardian of cultural authority.

Chapter 2

"Whispering in Doorways": Thomas Moore and Satiric Sedition

But my dear Lady -----, can't you hit on some notion,
At least for a night to set London in motion? –
As to having the Regent, that show is gone by –
Besides, I've remarked that (between you and I)
The Marchesa and he, inconvenient in more ways,
Have taken much lately to whispering in doorways;
Which, considering you know, the size of the two,
Makes a block one's company cannot get through. (Moore, *Intercepted Letters*, 14-21).

Once a staunch supporter of the Whig party and their causes, by 1813 the Prince Regent, later known as George IV, was frequently and vehemently satirized in the press for his political faithlessness. Many Whigs, including the poet Thomas Moore, had looked to the Regent and his promised Whig government as a "new dawn in British politics" (J. Moore, 57), particularly for the Catholic population of England and Ireland who depended on the Prince's support of Catholic Emancipation. For these citizens of Great Britain, the Prince's abandonment of Whig principles after the expiration of the Regency Act of 1811 was particularly embittering. Although public outrage against the Regent was mostly curbed due to anti-libel and anti-sedition laws (which would be strengthened under the passage of the Six Acts of 1819), critics took to public satire as a means of expressing their frustration and political dissent. The Regent himself provided his detractors with abundant grounds for criticism, both personal and political, thanks to his lavish lifestyle and

extramarital activities, both moral failings critics used to exemplify his unfitness to rule. Many of these criticisms appeared in the form of anonymous squibs, although other, more readily attributable verses also earned their authors (such as Byron and Leigh Hunt) censure and retribution. While Moore also authored several of these squibs, such as "Parody of a Celebrated Letter," the passage given above is taken from his first book length satire, *Intercepted Letters, or, the Two-Penny Post-Bag*. In this passage, Mary Monckton, the Countess Dowager of Cork, fictitiously laments the difficulties of high society entertaining thanks to the Regent's fall from grace. On the surface, the exchange between the Countess and her imaginary correspondent illustrates two of the frequent *ad hominem* attacks on the Regent, mockery of his weight and criticism of his affair with the (also rotund) Marchesa, Lady Hertford. Yet this exchange also contains an edge of political criticism thanks to the Countess's affiliations with the Whig party and her deceased husband's status as a member of the Irish peerage. Thus, when the Countess declares that the Regent's "show is gone by," she refers not only to his effect as a social novelty, but also his efficacy as a leader for Whig principles and Catholic Emancipation.

The imagery of the Regent's "cumbersome love-work" provides a compelling metaphor, one that juxtaposes the Regent's unfaithfulness with the political dissent of the satirist. The Regent conducts his illicit personal business in doorways, a space that is between rooms and therefore separate from either; a space that is simultaneously public, or visible, due to the presence of other party guests, while also being private, or invisible, thanks to the guests' restricted access caused by the "block" created by the Regent and his mistress, as well as the "whispering" that excludes them from the conversation. These contrasting factors allow the Regent to conduct personal business in the public eye by virtue of the social mores that forbid open criticism of his behavior. The liminal space of the doorway symbolizes the ways in which the Regent straddles the line between political

parties, as a step one direction or the other indicates a new alliance, while the "block" created by the Regent and his mistress suggests not only a lack of communication between the parties but also an inability to uncover the Regent's real motivations. In the space of the doorway, the Regent's political actions become as self-serving as his relationship with the Marchesa.

This image of whispering, however, also suits the satirist, Moore, who criticizes publicly, but behind the cover of a pseudonymous authorship, his activities hidden by dint of the London social world of which he is simultaneously a part through his authorial success, as well as an interloper in because of his Irish nationality. Although the Countess Dowager functions as Moore's mouthpiece in the letter, the reader may easily imagine Moore being present at one such gathering, thanks to the Countess's patronage of leading literary figures of the day. The metaphor, combined with Moore's shadowy presence in the epistle, serves as a description of the whole of Moore's career as a satirist, "whispering in doorways," in order to protest the unfair treatment of the Irish and Catholics within Great Britain, while maintaining a level of secrecy to protect himself from criticism. Even as the Regent proceeds to "whisper" in order to hide his illicit behaviors, Moore's own "whispering" steadily reveals the Prince's underhanded activities. Jane Moody raises this line of inquiry in her article "Thomas Brown [alias Thomas Moore], Censorship and Regency Cryptography," although Moody limits her argument specifically to the persona of Thomas Brown and the influence of Leigh Hunt's trial for seditious libel on *The Two-Penny Post-Bag*; Moore's previous Juvenalian satires are exempted from the discussion. However, this metaphor suggests the presence of a pattern throughout Moore's works and personal life (as it pertains to demonstrations of nationalism and national identity), a pattern in which Moore engages in a game of verbal peek-a-boo with his audience. Those elements of his life and work that are visible, or readily attributable to Thomas Moore, exhibit behaviors that present himself and the Irish in a way that conforms to

acceptable standards of English upper-class conduct. By holding himself to these (presumably higher) ideals, Moore demonstrates the ways in which the Irish are socially, culturally, and intellectually equal to the English. On the other hand, those works in which Moore uses pseudonymous authorship create narrative distance between himself and the subversive views being expressed, simultaneously revealing the injustices carried out against the Irish and Catholics while enabling a level of deniability to protect himself against accusations of sedition. In this chapter, I will argue that over the course of Moore's early satiric career, particularly in the shift from Juvenalian to Horatian mode satire, he develops this game of "verbal peek-a-boo," a pattern of visible versus invisible behavior that functions as a form of poetic political protest by allowing him to criticize the government and its key figures without opening himself to charges of sedition. It is this "game" that allows him to dismantle the English hierarchy from both sides while establishing that the Irish are indeed socially, culturally, and intellectually equal to their English counterparts.

Whereas satirists such as Robert Burns chanced the censure of local religious leaders, and Lord Byron, Moore's contemporary, certainly risked falling afoul of the same anti-libel and anti-sedition laws, still, neither satirist undertakes the same level of danger as Moore. Burns was protected from a great deal of censure due to the nature of his satires, which turned inward to critique the Scottish people more often than they turned outward to ridicule the English government. Furthermore, the persona of the "heaven-taught plowman" Burns cultivated shields him somewhat from the harsher consequences of his actions by seemingly giving his detractors an easy handle for dismissing the potency of his verse due to his alleged lack of education. On the other hand, Moore's friend and contemporary, Lord Byron, risks political and legal retribution, but thanks to his noble status and English birth, possesses both the social backing and practical means to evade the majority of consequences. (By the publication of Byron's most vicious political satires,

he was already abroad and geographically removed from the consequences of seditious writing.) Moore, however, risks personal safety, financial stability, professional reputation, and personal identity in the satires he publishes as political protest.

Moore's body of work occupies a precarious position in terms of political activism. On the one hand, he achieved great success in Britain, Ireland, and America with his *Irish Melodies*, a collection of lyrical compositions set to traditional Irish airs. Although the *Melodies* appeared in eight volumes between 1808 and 1834, the collection maintains a strong thematic unity built around nostalgia for the former glory of an independent Ireland, a theme that may be found in varying degrees throughout his works. This sense of nostalgia marks a resurgence in Irish nationalist dialogue in the British press due to the intersection of two factors, one being the growing trend toward Celtic antiquarianism in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and the other being the unpopular union of Ireland with Great Britain that was enacted in 1800. This nationalist dialogue in turn highlighted the internal social, cultural, and political conflicts between the centralized British government seated in London, and Britain's subsidiary states, Scotland and Ireland. However, contemporary critics such as William Hazlitt viewed Moore's works as exploiting national fervor in order to court literary fashion and English high society, laying the foundation for a longstanding dismissal of Moore's body of work as an authentic voice of Irish nationalism.

On the other hand, Moore was an accomplished satirist, with several longer satiric works in addition to the numerous aforementioned squibs published in the *Morning Chronicle*. These longer verses include *Corruption and Intolerance* (1808), *The Sceptic* (1809), *Intercepted Letters, or the Two-Penny Post-Bag* (1813), and *The Fudge Family in Paris* (1818), satires in which the theme of nationalism is more overt and assertive than in the *Irish Melodies*. In these works, Moore exhibits an acute sensitivity to the effects of anti-Irish measures undertaken by the British government and

the Irish patriotism that arose in response. As a result, Moore's satires become a form of poetic activism, creating awareness of the slights and injustices carried out against the Irish people and advocating for social change, particularly the repeal of remaining British measures to suppress Catholics (and by extension the Irish in general) that had been put in place after the Revolution of 1688. Between these works, however, Moore's poetic style undergoes a significant shift from the antagonistic tone of Juvenalian satire, which reflects the destructive, militaristic attitudes of 1798 and the Irish Rebellion, to the lighter, less antagonistic Horatian mode. This transition reflects Moore's changing politics as Horatian satire's less aggressive tone marks a "letting go" of the violent measures used by the United Irishmen during the Rebellion and ultimately function as a means of peaceful resistance to British oppression of the Irish.

This resistance is complicated by Moore's own dependence upon the English public as his audience, as well as anti-sedition and anti-libel laws enacted during the early nineteenth-century in an effort to quash domestic rebellions inspired by the French Revolution. To answer these difficulties, he develops strategies that could be termed, as Lord Byron would call them in other circumstances,[24] "Moore's verbal acrobatics" – adept verbal maneuvering that would allow Moore to express pro-Irish and nationalistic sentiments while carefully avoiding charges of sedition as well as maintaining the good will of his largely English reading public. In the case of Moore's letter to Byron, he simultaneously proposes friendship while also demanding satisfaction for the insults leveled in the text of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, an awkward balance achieved by means of carefully worded overtures and deference to Byron's social status. In the satires, for the most

[24] i.e. The circumstances surrounding the publication of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, in which Moore challenged Byron to a duel for insults that appeared in Byron's notes. Byron was greatly amused by the letter prompting his remark in which Moore carefully broached friendship and satisfaction simultaneously. (See note 61, p158 and note 92, p217)

part, Moore negotiates the boundary between Irish nationalism and sedition by use of the epistolary format, particularly in his later works, *The Two-Penny Post Bag* and *The Fudge Family in Paris*, where he includes shifting speakers and pseudonyms, as well as changing from the classical Juvenalian mode used in *Corruption and Intolerance* to a more light-hearted, genial, Horatian tone in the latter works. This tone was better suited to his reputation as a society darling and was less likely to offend his audience, an advantage that also allows him to deflect the severest parts of his critique while advocating for social and political unity with the English readers as well as demonstrating the abject unfairness of anti-Irish political and cultural practices.

These strategies were not without cost as Moore was accused of pandering by a number of his contemporaries, such as William Hazlitt who accuses Moore in *The Spirit of the Age* (1825) of pandering to contemporary taste with overly flowery and ornamental language, and to the upper classes and Whig politicians at the expense of a "genuine" patriotism. These charges have carried over into modern criticism of Moore's works thanks to authors such as William Yeats and have been largely to blame for the lack of dedicated scholarship on Moore and his works.[25] Such criticism, however, performs a disservice to Moore by failing to recognize the rhetorical strategies at play, strategies that function both on commercial and national levels.

Moore's desire to preserve the good will of his readers is not only a practical move, as it helps to secure continued readership and commercial success, but also demonstrates a desire to place himself within a larger and more inclusive group as a citizen of Great Britain as opposed to being labeled as "merely" an Irishman in London. In both, Moore's rhetorical strategies indicate an awareness of different social and cultural groupings that reflect the multi-national makeup of the

[25] Simon Kress also cites Patrick Kavanagh, Brendan Kennelly, and Tom Paulin as other modern Irish writers who are critical of Thomas Moore's works (123).

British state as well as a desire to cultivate a personal national identity that is flexible enough to navigate those various groupings, which Benedict Anderson terms "imagined communities" (1991). As Moore shifts from Juvenalian satire into Horatian verse, he redefines not only Irish identity, but the identity of the Irish poet as belonging to both Ireland *and* Britain, a definition similar to the inclusive nationalism espoused by the United Irishmen, but that willingly acknowledges Ireland's place within the larger nation of Great Britain while upholding the individuality and cultural validity of Irishness.[26] Moore accomplishes this in the shift from Juvenalian from Horatian verse due to the differences in satiric style associated with both forms. Moore's earlier, Juvenalian verse tends to employ the standard characteristics of formal verse satire found in the (English) Augustan and classical tradition, including a strict pattern of closed couplets and a single speaker (Dyer 96), as well as Dryden's prescriptive rules that satire should be limited to one subject, as it promotes one virtue while criticizing a particular vice (Griffin 19). In the later satires, however, the more playful character of Horatian satire allows Moore to blend stylistic elements taken from classical satire, the rhetoric of sentiment and sympathy common used by the United Irishmen movement, and traditionally Irish motifs, such as the *aisling* tradition, an Irish tradition of imagery in which Ireland is personified as a beautiful, idealized woman who is often identified as a "forsaken Ireland […] expecting to be reunited with her prince" (Vance 19).[27] These elements are partially present in Moore's earlier satires, but function independently and imperfectly due to the apparently more rigid structure of Juvenalian verse. This stylistic shift appears to indicate a shift in Moore's ideological construct of nationalism, or at least an acknowledgement that the limitations of Juvenalian satire were ill-suited to express his principles of national identity. While the Juvenalian

[26] Thuente and Wright both note the "inclusive" nature of the United Irishmen movement, at least as far as it include all Irishmen, regardless of religious creed, political affiliation, or social or economic status.
[27] See also Quinn and Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland*.

verse itself is rigidly controlled in form and content, this rigidity, particularly in the content, is at odds with the inclusive nationalism proposed by the United Irishmen, whereas the multi-speaker and multi-metrical (and thus multi-voiced), attributes of the Horatian mode consciously acknowledge the religious, cultural, linguistic, and social diversity of the Irish identity, and ultimately prepares an argument for an Irish national identity that also acknowledges its participation in the British state. The Horatian mode helps to facilitate this blending of both Irish and English identities by removing the more abrasive and polarizing effects of Juvenalian verse that are at odds with the forward thinking, positivist goals of the United Irishmen movement and its goal of inclusiveness. Moore's Horatian satires become a point at which both the individual national constituents and the collective are celebrated and encouraged together.

Irish History and the Problem with Nationalism

Although Thomas Moore presented himself as an educated gentleman during his days as a society darling in London, his own origins and family history reflect the contradictory (and in some cases antagonistic) sides of Irish identity. Significantly, Moore's parents hailed from different areas of the country and represented traditional Irish culture and English-influenced Irish culture. Although little is known about his father's family, John Moore came from County Kerry, a primarily Gaelic-speaking area known as a "Gaeltacht" on the western side of Ireland, while his mother, Anastasia Codd, the eldest daughter of a successful merchant, hailed from Wexford (Kelly, 8), a county on the eastern coast of Ireland with a long-standing history of English occupation and influence. Such differences exemplify some of the fragmentation evident within the Irish population, although the most pronounced differences occur between the Irish Catholic majority

and the English-allied Protestant Ascendancy minority. Such differences are common within a political state, as Tamar Mayer describes:

> …even though state is often perceived as the political extension of nation (Connor 1978), […] rarely do we find a pure nation-state that constructs a 100 percent fit between a nation and the state territory that it occupies. More often than not, instead, we find states which house many nations, leading to a hierarchy among these nations and creating a competition among them over control of resources and the exercise of power as a means to achieve national hegemony within the state. (3)

The situation Mayer describes here is precisely the political and cultural situation of Great Britain as a whole, an uneasy union between Welsh, Scottish, Irish and English nations, and within Ireland particularly with a population divided along political, cultural, linguistic, and religious lines. Between these various "nations," the political state, which was based in England, noticeably and deliberately privileged English citizens over other, less Anglicized inhabitants. Yet, as the intangible aspects of national identity are subject to outside influence, the boundaries of identity are subject to shift and blend, leading to even further gradations of identity within the boundaries of the state. Because of these gradations within Irish identity, any discussion of the state of Irish nationalism and the burgeoning nationalist movement needs to be front-ended by a brief history of the Irish conflict with England, which I will provide below. This historical review is necessary to contextualize the discussion of Thomas Moore's work, as the longstanding conflict between England and Ireland gives rise to several complications and contradictions regarding the condition of Ireland and Irish identity, based on historical, political, and social factors.[28]

[28] See Justin Quinn, *The Cambridge Introduction to Modern Irish Poetry, 1800-2000* and Norman Vance, *Irish Literature Since 1800*.

English involvement in Ireland took the form of various waves of invasion, beginning with the 1171 invasion of Ireland by Henry II, and continued through the reign of King James I. These attempts yielded little political control, but resulted in a cultural supplanting and Anglicization of various sections of Ireland, such as the area immediately surrounding Dublin (dubbed The Pale[29]) and the Ulster provinces under James I. The latter movement, the Plantation of Ulster, consisted of a deliberate attempt to colonize northern Ireland by confiscating lands belonging to the insurgent Irish aristocracy and resettling the properties to English, Scottish, and Welsh emigres who later became known as the Protestant Ascendancy.[30] The restrictions placed on land grants required applicants to be English speaking, Protestant, and to import more English or Scottish settlers, significantly, those Scottish settlers from "the inward parts of Scotland" (Leyburn 93), in order to work the land. This last restriction, as James Leyburn notes, specifically excluded Scottish Highlanders as potential settlers (94), most likely due to their predominantly Gaelic-speaking and Catholic population, similarities that would have undermined the project as a whole thanks to their linguistic and religious similarities to the Irish natives.

Whereas the earlier attempts to repopulate Ireland with English nationals had failed either due to the settlers' tendency to assimilate and then reject English authority or to the insufficient number of English participating, the Plantation of Ulster marked a more thorough, damaging, and permanent cultural shift, which denotes the beginnings of the problems inherent with Irish

[29] A "Pale" was the term used to denote a defended region, in this case, Dublin and the immediately surrounding counties where "English control was relatively secure and English influence predominant" (Leyburn 83). This division marks another cultural, linguistic, and nationalist split in Irish identity due to the lingering effects of English occupation in these areas, including religion and language. Areas beyond the Pale, occupied by the "wild Irish," maintained traditional elements of Irish culture, such as clan rule, Irish Gaelic, and Catholicism, although they were also exhibited the qualities of poverty, illiteracy, and primitiveness that the English scorned (Leyburn 84).
[30] See James Graham Leyburn, *The Scotch-Irish: A Social History* and Padraig Lanihan, *Consolidating Conquest, Ireland 1603-1727.*

identity.[31] These sixteenth- and seventeenth-century conflicts establish the primary factors dividing the Irish nation as the Plantation of Ulster necessarily introduced English-speaking Protestant settlers into a primarily Catholic, Gaelic-speaking populace, creating an Irish nation fractured by differences in religion, nationality, and language as a result of ongoing English occupation and cultural supplanting.

The political status of Ireland changed with the shifting religious views of subsequent monarchs, until Protestant king William III enacted the "Penal Laws," a series of measures that severely limited Catholic rights in business and trade, education, inheritance, and government participation, as well as limiting Irish trade in general (Vance 7). The most severe restrictions were gradually repealed by the Catholic Relief Acts of 1778, 1782, and 1792-93[32] in an effort to avoid another revolutionary outbreak such as the one in the American Colonies (Pakenham 26), although the parts of the acts regarding political participation served mainly as relaxations of restrictions rather than full repeals. Still, the gradual nature of the reforms took the shape of a decades-long tease, creating an atmosphere of frustration for the Irish that was further agitated by the strong anti-Catholic sentiment pervading the political climate. Adding to the public's frustrations, the majority of these concessions applied only to Protestants, as middle class Catholics were still excluded from military service, commissions of the peace, and positions of political power, particularly excluding them from sitting in Parliament (Pakenham 27). Meanwhile, the lower class, impoverished, Gaelic-speaking Irish continued to suffer under "grievances [that] were economic

[31] Leyburn describes Elizabeth I's earlier attempts to implement English colonies within Ireland, including attempts in Leinster and Munster in the 1560s and two attempts in Ulster in the 1570s. These attempts failed because "the Irishmen who had been driven away were so numerous that…they would come back to raid, burn and harass the new settlers; but chiefly…because not enough Englishmen could be induced to migrate to make a strong military force at the same time they were becoming effective farmers" (84-85).

[32] The final act of 1829 repealed any remaining restrictions.

and social – high taxes and low prices, and an impossibly harsh land system – and [that] were exacerbated by the differences of culture and religion" (Pakenham 27). According to Pakenham, "For them [the Irish peasantry], the Irish Parliament was the Parliament of the alien landlord and the heretic" (26). However, this assertion understates the internal fragmentation evident in and deepened by these concessions, as the compromises primarily served to appease a Protestant minority rather than the Catholic majority, fostering resentment between the two religious groups, as well as a sense of alienation between a large portion of the general population and the government that claimed to represent them.

At first, these various social and cultural divisions and subdivisions appear to fit the criteria of the "imagined communities" theorized by Benedict Anderson, yet these various groupings remained highly polarized due to the English privileging of the Protestant, English-speaking residents of Ireland over the largely Catholic, Gaelic-speaking native population, preventing the formation of a more universal sense of "Irishness" throughout much of the eighteenth century. Anderson defines the *nation* as "an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (6), yet this definition can hardly be applied to Ireland for several reasons. Firstly, Ireland, under English occupation, was neither sovereign nor limited as the "nation's" imagined borders were subsumed and erased under English rule. Protestant politicians and landowners held a vested interest in "[upholding] the English commercial, legal, and political systems" (State, 129), essentially identifying themselves more as English than Irish in behavior and loyalties, particularly in the case of absentee landlords who attempted to court social and political favor in London while ignoring their responsibilities in Ireland (Trumpener, 21).[33] Secondly, the

[33] Trumpener identifies the absentee landlord as a figure of scorn in both Ireland and England, particularly in the works of Maria Edgeworth: "Such landlords, Edgeworth argues, are driven by contradictory imperatives and loyalties; while they desert their local responsibilities and make continual, unreasonable financial demands on

openly antagonistic relationship between the Protestant Ascendancy and the Catholic majority (State, 129-130) undermines the sense of *community* on which Anderson's theory is framed. This structure of "community" exists, he argues, "because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep horizontal comradeship" (7). It was not until the latter years of the eighteenth century that this "comradeship" would begin to develop under the auspices of rational progress and advances in science, technology, trade, and communication, as interactions between landlords and affluent Irish businessmen brought about "an increasing conformity to English middle-class standards of speech and manners" (State 142-143).

The vital part of Anderson's definition, however, occurs in the word "imagined," as the political force of the nation is primarily the product of an internal conceptualization and self-identification. For Ireland, or at least the Catholic portion of the population, this imagined national identity relies heavily on a process of myth-building. As Mayer describes, members of the "nation" are united by "[belief] in their common origins and in the uniqueness of their common history" (3) and "share national symbols like customs, language, and religion, and are often blind to the fact that their national narrative is based on myth" (3). This last statement, the emphasis on myth, points to the fragility of such a narrative and the sense of "national identity" that results, since the perpetuation of the "national myth" is dependent upon the individual's acceptance and participation in the myth. This participation is likewise subject to outside influences, such as colonialism, which possibly damage the sense of national identity formed by these myths by eliminating or supplanting national culture. As already seen, the waves of English occupation

---

their impoverished Irish tenants, in a vain bid to win status and recognition in London, English society mocks and despises them as backward representatives of a backward people" (21).

steadily eroded and replaced a large portion of the existing national myth, however, the corollary to this concept is that if the myth of national identity is subject to outside influences, it is subject to change from within as well. This internal change occurs in the development of antiquarian studies across Ireland and Scotland during the eighteenth century, as native Irish, who although they had conformed to English standards of behavior, continued to uphold traditional Irish customs and arts, and "fostered a myth of a former golden age, constantly reminding Irish Catholics that they were the descendants of glorious ancestors" (State 130). Such antiquarian myth-building, or myth-substitution, sets the native Irish further at odds with the members of the Protestant Acendancy. Moore embarks on his poetic career during this time of "myth building," as this resurgence in antiquarian interest provides the foundation for the *Irish Melodies* and grounds an appeal for Irish cultural harmony in spite of religious, linguistic, and political differences. Yet it is his satires that are more strategically positioned to grapple with the political debates surrounding the ongoing Catholic concessions and the gradual repeal of the Penal Acts.

Overvaluing the Melodies

Moore's ongoing advocacy for the restoration of social, political, and economic freedoms for the Irish is, throughout his works, a markedly personal battle, since, as an Irish Catholic, he directly experienced the discriminatory practices of anti-Catholic and anti-Irish legislation. This advocacy comes through in his work with decidedly nationalist themes that are most prevalent in works such as the *Irish Melodies*, the collection of poems that has been the primary focus of scholarship to this point. The *Melodies* seem to attract this scholarship, since, according to Simon Kress and Leith Davis, music functions as a "deeply political art form bound up in the long history of colonialism in Ireland" (Kress 130) and as a "positive aspect of Irish identity, the only positive

aspect, in fact, during the early years of colonization of Ireland" (Davis, 4)[34]. This emphasis on the lyrical body of Moore's work, however, has not shielded the poet from criticism and near obscurity in literary discussions. In his article, Kress lingers over Seamus Heaney's attempts to restore interest in Moore's poetry as containing cultural and national value, drawing attention to one of the primary issues pervading discussions of Moore's body of work, that being the perceived necessity of redeeming Moore as an authoritative and authentic voice of Irish nationalism. Starting with Moore's contemporary, William Hazlitt, and continuing through the work of more modern writers such as William Yeats, Moore's work customarily has been dismissed as the early nineteenth-century equivalent of mass entertainment due to the extraordinary popularity of the *Irish Melodies* and their appeal to female audiences through sentimental and romanticized themes. In contrast, Heaney, and by implication, Kress as well, argue that Moore's more humble and more widely accessible cultural dominance makes him, "in fact more in touch with the actual experiences of most Irish people than certain doyens of Irish modernism" (132) such as Yeats and Joyce who represent the high-literary tradition. This "everyman" perspective allows us more of a first-hand point of view at a critical moment in Irish history, particularly as the political, social, and cultural stigmas associated with the Irish affected the less privileged classes.

However, we see the limitations of a nationalist approach in the studies of Davis and Julia Wright, who, like Kress, seek to redeem Moore's works so as to construct a national literary history, since these studies rarely look outside the *Melodies* for examples of Moore's nationalist rhetoric. These typically begin with and perpetuate the debate regarding Moore's "authenticity" as a voice of Irish nationalism, resulting in a specific set of themes that directly answer the nature of criticism

[34] Unless otherwise noted, all references to Davis's work in this chapter are taken from *Music, Postcolonialism, and Gender: The Construction of Irish National Identity, 1724-1874.*

previously levied against Moore and his works. These themes include examinations of the Enlightenment rhetoric of sensibility that informed the political belief system underlying the formation of the United Irishmen, as well as depictions of gender, colonialism, the emergent nationalist movements, and Irish national identity.[35] In addition to the thematic limitations, to give such weight to the *Melodies* is something of a disservice to Moore's other significantly nationalist works, such as his satires, since these discussions neglect to engage significantly with other works in which the expression of nationalism is stronger and more direct. One way in which these limitations can be overcome is to apply the lines of inquiry present in arguments concerning the *Melodies*, in particular discussions of gender and the rhetoric of sensibility, to the satires as well to shed new light on the function of satire in nationalist dialogue of the early nineteenth-century as a means of confronting and countering popular anti-Catholic and anti-Irish misconceptions and stereotypes in a way that is more forceful and immediate than that which is found in the *Melodies.*

Davis begins her argument in by indirectly answering previous criticisms of Moore as a "patriot for hire" by pointing to the ways in which the project was originally conceived for an English audience, both in the deliberately nationalist content and the choice of Moore as lyricist. Although repeating this analysis is one of the primary pitfalls of discussing the *Melodies* in isolation from Moore's other nationalist works, Davis's discussion of sympathy implies a point of entry into examination of the satires as a rhetorical outgrowth of the *Melodies*. She argues that James and William Powers, the publishers behind the *Melodies*, specifically selected Moore as the lyricist for

[35] Sensibility can, in rather pithy, oversimplistic terms, be defined as an emphasis on sympathy or empathy between the reader and the narrator or character's emotional response. Wright declares that "The discourse of sensibility, offering a model of universal sympathy that emphasizes human connection over social and cultural difference, makes it possible to conceive of the colonized nation as something other than, in Deane's phrase, a 'strange country'" (53). Such rhetoric was employed by the United Irishmen in order to cultivate sympathy in English readers toward the Irish and their suffering under English colonial domination.

the project in an effort to appeal to an English-dominated literary market. His previous commercial and literary success with classical verse in the *Odes of Anacreon* (1800) and its dedication to the Prince Regent (141-142), were factors that would have bolstered Moore's appeal to an English audience (although this patronage was used by his contemporaries as a way of discrediting him with accusations of careerism). With this in mind, she proposes that Moore's work on the *Melodies* served the dual purpose of inspiring Irish nationalism while also "making Ireland consumable in English parlors where, although there may have been sympathy for the Irish, there was no question of accepting Irish Home Rule" (140). Elsewhere, Davis suggests that the apathy present in English readers is the result of a possible double reading of the *Melodies*, a reading in which an English audience "saw Romantic images of Irish defeat and subordination" ("Irish Bards and English Consumers", 11). Although the *Melodies* appeared concurrently with Moore's Juvenalian satires, I would argue here that, despite the apparent "apathy" of the English readership, the success of the *Melodies* actually prepares the reading public for the publication of Moore's later, Horatian satires. Firstly, The *Melodies* lay the foundation for the reception of the Horatian satires by the power of association – whereas Moore's Juvenalian satires stood independently as anonymous publications, allusions within the titles of Moore's pseudonymous Horatian satires would allow the readership to discern their true authorship and easily view the later poems in light of the totality of Moore's attributed works, including the *Melodies*. Secondly, the *Melodies* open the readership to a more palatable and hybridized representation of Irish identity based on the rhetoric of Sensibility. As Davis asserts, the "moments of conflict [present in the representations of colonization] symbolize moments of hybridization" (145) and mark Irish identity as "a state of tension and translation rather than a static state of authenticity" (145). The latter satires, therefore, represent a literary hybridization of the rhetoric of sensibility and the strength of satire, a combination that would

make a "double reading" similar to the one Davis sees in the *Irish Melodies* unlikely, if not impossible.

This appeal to sensibility is also the primary thread of Julia Wright's argument as she examines the relationship between sensibility and depictions of colonization. Wright considers Moore to be one of many Irish authors who possess the unique vantage point of being able to critique colonialism from inside the colonized state, a criticism that also relies heavily on the Enlightenment rhetoric of sensibility as demonstrated within the writings of the United Irishmen and their associates. The United Irishmen drew on such philosophies as a means of overcoming the longstanding divisions between language, religion, and culture in the Irish population at large based on their ideological belief in an inclusive state (20, 29) in order to facilitate "cross-cultural identification" (3). The use of sentimental rhetoric in the *Melodies* serves as the primary mode for targeting both Irish and English readers and drawing them into a shared, although tenuous sense of national identity, since, as Davis observed, such sympathy on the part of English readers may have lessened animosity, but not to the extent of fully persuading English readers to support Irish Home Rule. As I apply this line of inquiry to the satires, the rhetoric of sensibility again becomes a tool for drawing readers into sympathy and identification with the Irish cause, although that sympathy is also manipulated in ways that not only overtly reveal the injustices of the English oppression of Ireland but create a call-to-action to overcome these injustices. This argument unites the readers against a common foe, the English political state, while celebrating both the individuality of Irish and English identity, as well as the united identity of the citizens of Great Britain. While the *Melodies* also accomplished this to an extent, the more direct, forceful application of the rhetoric of sentiment in combination with satire creates a more immediate, present-day narrative in which the reading public is expected to take action to overcome English state oppression, however, this action

is stressed in a non-violent way. By combining sensibility with satire, the resulting Horatian satires not only retain the goodwill of the reading public that was generated by the *Melodies*, but also overcome the militaristic and violent history associated with the United Irishmen and the uprising of 1798.

A second line of inquiry that can be carried over from the *Melodies* to the satires is discussions of gender in both Davis and Wright, although the authors' respective positions differ greatly in the ways in which these arguments are framed, as Davis approaches gender as a feature that is imposed by the reader, while Wright approaches gender from the perspective of the poet's own projections of national identity. Davis, on the one hand, discusses gender and the gendering of the *Melodies* as an outgrowth of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century discourses on music in general, which "was utilized variously in the representations of both national and colonialist formations" (1). She argues that Moore's use of the *aisling* tradition of Irish poetry is a way of gendering the nation of Ireland and describing the colonial relationship between Ireland and England and that Moore's work demonstrates the ways in which colonialization works to feminized the colonized (155). However, according to Davis, the reading public tended to apply the same feminization to Moore himself, thanks to his appeal to a female readership (157), his performance of the *Melodies* and his small physical size (both attributes typically associated with females or the effeminate) (162). She concludes by arguing that "Moore's work and his body cannot be separated from the gendered colonial relationship between Ireland and England" (162), a lack of perceived separation that ultimately gave critics the basis for discrediting Moore specifically, and by extension, the Irish as a whole. This presents an additional problem with Davis's argument, since this reading also presents the potential for gendered ambiguity within the *Melodies.* This English-imposed feminization of work and author is a primary reason that the *Melodies* cannot stand as the

last word on Irish nationalism or national identity. But by later turning to a more virile, traditionally masculine form of poetry such as the satires, Moore eliminates these gendered ambiguities in such a way as to redeem and reclaim the masculine power of the poet as a voice of the people.

Conversely, Wright examines the poet's own projections of national identity as the product of the rhetoric of sensibility in her chapter, "Empowering the Colonized Nation," where she determines that this sense of masculine assertion is more prevalent in the *Melodies*. However, this argument seems to weaken when held up against Wright's other discussions of what she terms "antiquarian" versus "inaugural" nationalism, two competing schools of nationalist thought present in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. She argues that the early nineteenth-century print media enables the Irish to "transcend their (feminine) suffering and achieve agency within the empire […]; that is, they are allowed to exchange their feminine victimization for male power" (53) through the use of the rhetoric of sensibility and other poetic techniques such as Moore's use of the *aisling* tradition. In this tradition, the Irish nation is personified, feminized, and idealized so that it "becomes a rallying point for male heroism" (65) as the hero-poet creates a political perspective in which "love of nation and heteronormative desire are conflated with an ethics that demands respect to and assumes the virtue of both woman and nation" (61). This metaphor of virtue repeats itself in the differentiations between liberated and colonized Ireland as "Moore consistently identifies liberated Ireland with the chaste treatment of women and colonial Ireland with false or wronged women" (60-61).[36] The problem with Wright's argument is that the *Melodies*, with their tendency to look toward the past for a sense of national character, fall into what Wright terms

[36] This point is also broached by Tamar Mayer when she points to earlier research into gender and nationalism conducted by Yuval-Davis and Anthias (1989). According to their studies, "Only pure and modest women can reproduce the pure nation; without purity in biological reproduction the nation clearly cannot survive" (7). Although the threads of argument are markedly similar, Wright does not reference Mayer, Yuval-Davis, or Anthias in her argument.

"antiquarian" nationalism, a prioritizing of the distant past in such a way that the movement becomes self-feeding – it "circulates antiquities and antiquarian scholarship to propagate its ideological attachment to the distant past" (31). The problem with this view of nationalism is that such recursive logic ultimately defines national identity according to pre-colonial versions of religion, language, and culture, and invalidates the cultural changes brought about during English occupation. The *Melodies* may, as Wright argues, exemplify a grasp for male power by casting the poet in the role of hero who can redeem a dishonored and disenfranchised Ireland, but they can only engage with the present-day struggle for independence indirectly thanks to the backward-looking sentimentality present throughout the verses.

On the other hand, what Wright terms "inaugural nationalism" seeks to "transcend the past and move forward on a new track" (31), an approach to the national agenda that provides the basis for the United Irishmen's principles of inclusiveness and equality, and one that is better exemplified in Moore's Horatian satires. Many of the thematic and stylistic elements used in the *Melodies* are also present in the satires, both Juvenalian and Horatian, providing perhaps a more universal and more identifiable analogy for patriotism and national identity through depictions of romantic relationships and sexual faithful/faithlessness. The use and effect of this trope differs between the two sets of works in significant ways: firstly, in contrast to the *Melodies*, which primarily appealed to a female audience, the strong sexual overtones combined with the martial tone of the satires works to build support for Irish independence among the male readership; secondly, and perhaps more importantly, whereas the *Melodies* consists of a suggestively antiquarian setting that lessens the immediacy of the female's struggle, the satires present the faithful image of free Ireland or the false image of colonialized Ireland in the context of contemporary events, framing them as a matter of urgent concern for the male reader. Such a repetition puts the poet/hero in the position of the

benevolent suitor and protector of the nation and effectively calls the male readership to undertake the same role. Throughout the satires, Moore evokes sympathy for morally upright female characters while rallying the male hero as the symbol of masculine national strength, a pointed counter-argument to English depictions of the colonized Irish as effeminate and childlike, and thus incapable of home rule.

The United Irishmen, Honor, and Early Efforts

Moore's resistance to the English oppression of the Irish is a personal battle as much as a national one, as he personally experienced many of the limitations placed on Irish Catholics. His birth in 1779 positioned him in such a way as to take advantage of new opportunities being opened for Catholics while also subjecting him to these elements of lingering discrimination, the same combination of factors that contributed to the Irish Uprising of 1798. The detail of Moore's memoirs, without doubt, point toward the importance of these experiences and in the Preface to his collected works, Moore describes the growth of his poetic abilities around the events of the 1790s, from the outbreak of the French Revolution to the fateful Uprising (Moore, 19). Yet he also describes these circumstances with a slight tone of uncharacteristic bitterness, such as when he says that:

> Born of Catholic parents, I had come into the world with the slave's yoke around my neck; and it was all in vain that the fond ambition of a mother looked forward to the Bar as opening a career that might lead her son to affluence and honor. Against the young Papist all such avenues to distinction were closed; and even the University, the professed source of public education, was to him 'a fountain sealed.' Can any one now wonder that a people thus trampled upon should have hailed the first

> dazzling outbreak of the French revolution as a signal to the slave, wherever suffering, that the day of his deliverance was near at hand? (*Preface*, 19).

The "slave's yoke" Moore describes is a symbolic representation of Irish oppression that exaggerates the terms of English occupation for dramatic effect. These terms were dictated by the Penal Laws, a series of restrictions that systematically demoted the Irish to second-class citizens by limiting opportunities for education and lucrative employment. Such distinctions exacerbated the class divisions between the English and Irish (Catholic) citizens, thanks to exploitative trade restrictions that may have seemed like slavery in comparison. In particular, occupations such as the practice of law and holding political office were closed to Catholics, examples of those professions that Moore regards as providing "affluence and honor," a phrase that, on the surface, suggests financial and social success and privilege. However, the phrase also suggests the honor of performing one's civic duty by participating in the workings of law and government, ideally in the pursuit of justice and equality. Such systematic disenfranchisement is another example of the "slaves yoke" imposed by English oppression.

Moore's apparent preoccupation with so-called honorable professions marks an important trend throughout his career, namely paying careful attention to issues of honor and reputation in both his literary works and his personal life, even though at times he feels his actions yield little results.[37] As he mentions in his *Preface*, his mother's hope for his success stems from the Catholic Relief Act of 1791 and the Irish Relief Act of 1793, which had respectively opened up the legal profession for Catholics and allowed Catholics to enter Trinity College. However, these

[37] Whereas in certain circumstances, such as Moore's ill-fated dueling attempt with Francis Jeffrey and Moore's dueling challenge to Lord Byron, references to "honor" indicate the codified standards of behavior encompassed in the concept of "honor" and gentlemanly conduct, for the most part, Moore's apparent fixation on honor merely references the desire to be considered respectable, socially and culturally, according to English standards of behavior.

opportunities were not without their own restrictions, as Catholics were still ineligible for scholarships, fellowships, and prizes awarded for academic achievement (Kelly 14), and under these guidelines, Moore was denied the scholarship awarded as a prize for winning an exhibition in 1797 (Kelly 14). Moore states in his Preface that, "My showing that I *deserved* to attain [the same distinctions awarded to non-Catholics] would most gratify my anxious mother, I entered as a candidate for a scholarship and (as far as the result of the examination went) successfully. But, of course, the mere barren credit of the effort was all I enjoyed for my pains" (19). Moore's remarks aim at underscoring the unfair distinctions between students that were based solely on religious practice and not on merit. He refers to the students who received the awards as members of "the ascendant class" (19), a reference to the Protestant Ascendancy, the landowners who primarily belonged to the Protestant Church of Ireland and who controlled the majority of Ireland politically and economically. By competing against the privileged class, even though he was ineligible for the reward, Moore demonstrates the apparently higher standard to which he held himself, a standard apparently only applied to that privileged class. This competition is the first of many actions scholars and critics attribute to and dismiss as vanity, but in reality, this fixation on honor demonstrates Moore's efforts to redeem himself, personally, and the Irish in general, from unfavorable stereotypes attributed to the Irish nation.

While the early part of the 1790s saw advancements, however slow, in the way of Catholic Emancipation, the political climate in Ireland deteriorated rapidly during the latter half of the decade. English fears of French invasion prompted the suppression of political organizations within Britain, including the suppression of the Society of United Irishmen in May 1794 (Kelly 19). This was followed by the dismissal of the beloved Lord Fitzwilliam, a key Whig supporter of Catholic relief, from the Lieutenancy of Ireland and the rejection of further reform measures in 1795 (Kelly 19).

Perhaps the worst event precipitating the Uprising of 1798, was the British response to an attempted French invasion of Ireland in December 1796. While the invasion itself failed due to bad weather, to prevent further domestic rebellion, the British delegated responsibility for disarming citizens to local yeomanry, who were, as Kelly describes "for the most part Protestant volunteers who misused their powers outrageously, increasing sectarian bitterness by their treatment of the rural population. Houses were burnt down, pitch cappings, floggings, and half-hangings inflicted on the flimsiest excuse" (21-22). Although the United Society of Irishmen had been publicly suppressed, members had merely moved into an underground format as opposed to curtailing their meetings entirely and continued publishing a succession of democratic-minded newspapers such as the *Northern Star* (Belfast), the *National Journal* and *The Press* (Dublin) (Thuente 3, 108). *The Press* in particular operated under the hand of Thomas Addis Emmet, one of the leaders of the United Irishmen and older brother to Robert Emmet, who Moore met and befriended in the debating society at Trinity where open discussion of Ireland's political issues was forbidden (Kelly 20-22).

Although Moore was never directly involved with the Uprising, his early literary endeavors exemplify a desire to defend Ireland as well as the necessity of anonymity in seditious rhetoric. His friendship with the Emmet brothers put him in close proximity to the underground activities of the United Irishmen and he ventured to publish (anonymously) two seditious pieces in *The Press*, one a milder Ossianic imitation and the other a letter aimed at stirring the student population of Trinity to action against the oppressive English government.[38] In his memoirs, Moore describes the work as a

[38] T. Moore appears to have confused the order of the publications, perhaps thinking that he had been emboldened by the success of the poem to undertake the letter. In fact, the order was reversed. Jane Moore points out that the letter appeared 2 December 1797, while the Ossianic imitation was published with the 20 February, 1798 edition of *The Press*. Given this revised date, it appears that even after the concern expressed by Moore's family and friends over the overtly rebellious tone of the letter, Moore again ventured to publish in the political, nationalist vein, although rather than escalating the nationalist sentiment expressed, he scales back the force of his argument to a more politically and socially acceptable tone. Such a revision is perhaps indicative of his later efforts to articulate nationalist sentiment from a more guarded, safer, perspective.

"turgid Johnsonian sort of style, but seasoned with plenty of the then favourite condiment, treason" (Moore, *Memoirs*, 56). He frames the letter as a response to Montanus (the pseudonym of Thomas Addis Emmet (Thuente 1)),[39] defending Montanus against his detractor, "A Loyal Student of Trinity College." The shadow of "loyalty" plays a significant role in the exchange, as the detractor's self-identification as a "Loyal student" carries the implication of being a supporter of the English government, while Moore's letter in defense of Montanus/Emmet demonstrates both personal and national loyalty to Ireland. While the letter writers' allegiances create an "us and them," England versus Ireland, dynamic, Moore's "treasonous" insistence upon national fidelity clearly places loyalty to nation and culture above loyalty to the political construct. In the letter, he condemns the actions of the British government as "corrupt," "cruel," "flagitious," and unjust (48), agrees with Montanus that the current regime will never relinquish power willingly in order to effect change (48), and argues that thus far English promises to ease restrictions have resulted in "petty concessions" (49). He ends the piece by declaring that: "This is not a time to express a difference of Political opinion. No, we should all have one common cause, the welfare of our country; we should all Unite, rally round her standard, and recover our Heaven-born rights, our principles from the grasp of Tyranick ministers" (51). Such provocative rhetoric frames rebellion and sedition as an act of national and moral duty by emphasizing the overall "welfare" of the country and the universal "principles" that govern the Irish nation, including the lost honor, status, and respectability that had been stripped away under English occupation.

The tone of the letter, including its final, incendiary battle cry, not only echoes the overall character of patriotic discussions circulating in the writings and underground meetings of the

[39] Text of Moore's letter taken from L.A.G. Strong's biography of Moore, *The Minstrel Boy*, p 47-51. This is also the text cited by Kelly in her references to the letter.

United Irishmen, but also anticipates many of the features of Moore's later satiric verse efforts, particularly in the epistolary format and the letter's final call to action. The dominant tone of righteous indignation throughout the text is suggestive of the forthcoming Juvenalian verse of Moore's early satiric career, yet the resounding exhortation that ends the piece looks forward to the poetic activism found in the most developed satires, the Horatian-based *Two Penny Post Bag* and *Fudge Family in Paris*. When composing new material for these later satires, Moore likely reverted to a format that had already demonstrated success, given the initial praise the letter received from Moore's parents and Robert Emmet (Kelly 22-23). However, Moore's parents as well as Emmet cautioned him against involving himself with the rebellion, and Emmet in particular warned that such public discussion was likely to draw unwanted attention to the activities at Trinity College (Kelly 23).[40] It is from this emphasis on secrecy and anonymity that the satires draw the most influence. While the seditious nature of the piece leans heavily toward the Juvenalian, this quality also leaves the rhetoric too strong for prolonged, effective debate because of the highly-charged nature of the issue. Thus far, the activities of the United Irishmen had survived by means of dual-level discussions – the one, an impassioned but non-violent debate suitable for public consumption, and the other, more militant and aggressive commentary restricted to the safety of private meetings. Moore's letter in support of Montanus drags these seditious whisperings into the public eye where they would draw more heated public notice, and, as Emmet cautioned, in actuality

[40] Despite Moore's patriotic impetus, Emmet did not attempt to recruit Moore into the United Irishmen, a choice that Linda Kelly attributes to Emmet's knowledge of "how closely Moore was tied to his mother's apron strings, and that he was not the stuff of which conspirators were made" (23). Although in his *Memoirs*, Moore recalls once being invited by a different classmate to join a "Lodge," the Masonic term used by the United Irishmen to designate the local branches of the organization, Moore remained uninvolved and unaware of any of the group's plans.

undermine the activities of the United Irishmen rather than furthering the cause of Irish independence.

Even though Moore left off publishing in the political debate, his conduct during the official investigations at Trinity boldly marks him as a loyal support of the United Irishmen, even if not an actual participant. In mid-April 1789, among rumors circulating of a forthcoming rebellion, Moore was called before Trinity College's Lord Chancellor, John Fitzgibbon, Earl of Clare and Patrick Duigenan, both anti-Catholic agitators,[41] as part of a college-wide inquiry regarding charges of sedition among the student population. Moore's genuine innocence saved him from punishment or expulsion, although his connections to the Emmet brothers and other conspirators put him in a precarious situation. Ahead of the tribunal, several students, including Robert Emmet, had left the university, while several others, fearing expulsion, had given evidence implicating their classmates (de Verre White 16). As Kelly describes, at least one of Moore's classmates, although innocent of any personal involvement, had been dismissed for refusing to answer questions that might incriminate other students. Thus, when called for questioning, Moore found himself facing similar circumstances. Before testifying, students were expected to take an oath and in his *Memoirs*, Moore recalls objecting on the grounds that "I have no fear, my lord, that anything I might say would criminate myself, but it might tend to affect others; and I must say that I despise that

[41] While Moore notes in his memoirs that the name of Fitzgibbon "I had never heard connected but with domineering insolence and cruelty" (Moore, *Memoirs,* Vol I. 64), the political career of Lord Chancellor of Ireland, John Fitzgibbon, Earl of Clare (1748-1802) actually suggests a mixed stance toward Catholic issues, although his ultimate goal remained to uphold the supremacy of English rule and protestant authority. Fitzgibbon notably informed George III in 1795 that "further concessions to Catholics would betray his coronation oath to defend the protestant establishment in church and state," an assertion that helped solidify the King's position against further Catholic reform. His reactions to instances of civil unrest, such as the Whiteboy raids and the United Irishmen activities reflect a desire for swift and severe punishment; however, Fitzgibbon also advocated for clemency, including exile in exchange for testimony, and a general pardon for insurgents who were not officers in the ranks of the United Irishmen. (Dictionary of National Biography).
Patrick Duigenan (1734/5-1816) was a staunch and highly vocal anti-Catholic voice known for his opposition to Catholic relief. (Dictionary of National Biography).

person's character who could be led under any circumstances to criminate his associates" (Moore, 64). Under threat of dismissal, Moore took the oath, but the questioning proved fruitless, as Moore's answers revealed no knowledge of the United Irishmen's plans or membership. When questioned as to his reluctance to take the oath in the face of his innocence, he explains his objection as a reaction to "the first oath I ever took, and it was, I think, a very natural hesitation" (Moore, *Memoirs*, 65).

This hesitation served to underscore Moore's concern with honor by placing the welfare of friends and associates above his own, while his later explanation for his refusal to take the oath critiques the measures taken to unearth the seditious actors. Despite the social, cultural, and political restrictions in place against the Irish and against Catholics in particular, Moore continually attempts to uphold what he sees as honorable or gentlemanly conduct according to early nineteenth-century societal norms. These codes of gentlemanly behavior in many ways defied the stereotypes applied to the Irish, demonstrating the ways in which Moore sought to be included in the more privileged and respected classes of British citizenry. In his *Memoirs*, he records his behavior and state of mind with an overwhelming sense of anxiety about conducting himself honorably, yet these actions, and others undertaken by Moore, Strong briefly describes as a "theatrical appearance" (54), while Terrence de Verre White takes this description farther to ascribe to a sense of showmanship or concern with appearances. He describes Moore's response as a "performance" and concludes that: "He [Moore] was ever concerned about the impression he made—vanity, not conceit, predominated in his character" (de Verre White 17). Yet such comments seem dismissive of Moore's patriotism, particularly when de Verre White says that "This was the whole of Moore's revolutionary experience" (17), overlooking Moore's visit to Edward Hudson, one of the leaders of the rebellion after he was imprisoned for his role in the uprising

(Strong 54-55, Kelly 28). Instead, de Verre White notes that Moore dedicates a mere paragraph to the rebellion in his diary (17) before turning his focus to Moore's early amorous verses, popularity in society, and budding "literary ambition" (19), a focus that seems to echo the accusations made by Moore's contemporaries of pandering and a type of patriotism for profit. Although Moore's behavior appears to carry the gloss of vanity, such offhanded dismissal overlooks a consistent pattern of conduct demonstrating support for the nationalist cause, even when such behavior occurred only indirectly and outside of the public eye, much like the underground activities of the United Irishmen themselves.

Yet, as De Verre White and Linda Kelly note, the lack of prolonged discussion of the rebellion in Moore's *Memoirs* is a curious anomaly. Kelly postulates that a missing section, replaced only by three asterisks, may have been either destroyed by Moore's editor, Lord John Russell, or that "the events were too traumatic to recount" (28) since Moore refers to suffering from an illness during this time period. Kelly theorizes that, "perhaps the shock and emotional tension of the tribunal and its aftermath led to some kind of nervous collapse" (28). Without the text that those asterisks replaced, Kelly's theory remains mere speculation, however, the desire and/or *need* to hide that passage suggests a greater involvement, whether politically or emotionally motivated, in the events of the Uprising. Even though Moore suffered no *direct* consequences from the incident, the inquiry serves as a critical moment for him in the midst of a growing chaotic situation that became the United Irishmen Uprising of 1798, as insurgents made their way across the countryside toward Dublin itself and martial law soon was declared in Ireland. As Kelly notes, "even after the long interval before he came to write his memoirs, it is hardly surprising that the scene [of his questioning] was still clearly imprinted in his mind" (25).

Corruption and Intolerance

The sense of trauma that Kelly identifies in Moore's journal helps to explain the ruthlessness of his reactions in the early satires. His experiences even on the outskirts of the rebellion – watching friends prosecuted, being subject to martial law, and experiencing the re-tightening of restrictions against the Irish in the wake of the Uprising – provide the foundation for the anger, bitterness, and struggle for justice expressed in the verses. His first major published satires, *Corruption* and *Intolerance*, appeared anonymously in 1808, ten years after the Uprising, but shortly after new events resulting in both personal and professional disappointment, such as Moore's embarrassing dueling attempt with Frances Jeffrey and his patron, Lord Moira's, inability to obtain for him a position as an Irish commissioner (Kelly 71). These circumstances once again frame Moore's work in terms of honor and nationality, as the unfortunate events of the duel brought Moore's personal and professional reputation before the court of public opinion, while the inability to secure a respectable and lucrative position once again underscored the disadvantages faced by Irish Catholics in the professional realm. These embarrassments and disappointments extend beyond Moore himself to encompass the Irish as a whole, since Moore, as a well-known Irish author, functioned as a symbolic representation of the Irish in general to English readers. Jane Moore, however, identifies a more specific exigence for the work in the form of the "No Popery" elections of 1807, an election in which the possibility of Catholic emancipation hinged on the passage of a measure allowing the Crown to have veto power over appointment of Catholic bishops in Ireland (J. Moore, 19).[42] Together, these events contextualize Moore's state of mind as he wrote the satires, a state of mind that Kelly describes as "dejected" (71), particularly after Lord Moira's subsequent

[42] Kelly also mentions the elections (85-86), but neglects to connect the event with the publication of *Corruption and Intolerance*.

retirement in early 1807 and Moore's seemingly evaporating opportunities for advancement.[43] Kelly cites this mood of disillusionment as the catalyst for Moore's satires, as he told Lady Donegal in March 1807 that "I begin to find out that *politics* is the only thing minded in this country, and that it is better even to *rebel* against government, than have nothing at all to do with it; so I am writing politics" (Kelly, 74). This statement aptly sums Moore's frustrations, as the tragic events of 1798 had left him reluctant to venture into outspoken political activism, yet his attempts to advance from within the existing political climate remained continually unrewarded. Faced with mounting debt and financial distress despite his earlier literary success with works such as the *Odes of Anacreon*, *Poetical works of the Late Thomas Little, Esq*, and *Epistles, Odes, and other Poems*, Moore sought to become his own advocate in the face of his patron's lack of efficacy.

Even though Moore undertook the conscious decision to once again critique British oppression of Catholics and the Irish, he came up against the same problem of voice and attribution that he had encountered as a student at Trinity, namely, that publishing under his own name would leave him open to charges of sedition and treason. As the ongoing Napoleonic Wars fed political insecurities and fears of domestic uprising, the British press and political systems maintained a heightened sensitivity to criticism, as seen by the creation of several organizations intended to root out "vice", a concept that, in the wake of the French Revolution, came to encapsulate any type of social deviance, up to and including radical political beliefs and expressions in addition to moral aberration (Donelan 1). As with Moore's juvenile pieces published in *The Press*, anonymity was the safest way in which he could express his political frustrations and advocate not only for himself, but

[43] Moira upon the dissolution of the Ministry of All the Talents, a coalition consisting of members from all major political parties, founded by Prime Minister, Lord William Grenville (1806-1807). Issues of Catholic relief put the Ministry in direct conflict with George III, leading to Grenville's replacement by the Duke of Portland, a supporter of the Act of Union (1800) and a direct political opponent of Lord Moira. (Kelly 73-74).

also for the Irish Catholic majority, a move that becomes a symbolic sacrifice of self and personal voice in favor of a collective Irish identity. His previous works, *The Odes of Anacreon* and particularly *The Poetical Works of the Late Thomas Little, Esq*, also demonstrate questions of authorial attribution, although in these works, where Moore frames himself as the translator and editor, respectively, the need for pseudonymous authorship is based on the works' bawdier content rather than their expression of Moore's political beliefs.[44] Whereas both volumes exhibited similarly amorous and suggestive content, Justin Tonra notes that the classical nature of *Anacreon* as well as its status as translation protected Moore somewhat from accusations of immorality,[45] while the pseudonymous publication of *Little* provided the same function, although the pseudonym used, Thomas Little, is in and of itself a tongue-in-cheek reference to Moore, as "Little" was one his nicknames due to his small stature. Given that neither work expresses the type of political commentary found in Moore's satires, more rigorous efforts to hide his identity for the sake of his personal reputation are unnecessary. The readily recognizable pseudonyms used function as a form of verbal playfulness, a superficial measure of narrative distance that simultaneously acknowledges the social demand for decorum and respectability, while also enabling Moore to claim the work as his own. Such authorial double-speak mimics a game of verbal peek-a-boo in which Moore is simultaneously hidden from his audience, but visible and present by means of verbal association.

[44] On the one hand, some might argue that such distancing suggests the possibility of authorial insecurity in light of the lack of a clear Irish literary tradition, or the result of an Irish author attempting to blend in with an English-dominated literary marketplace. Specifically, Justin Tonra suggests that pseudonymous authorship is a "deliberate and ironic staging of a romantic persona" (553) that answers the reading public's need for biographical identification, while avoiding the public's tendency to gossip and conflate authorial persona with autobiography. See also Norman Vance, *Irish Literature Since 1800*, and Justin Quinn, *The Cambridge Introduction to Modern Irish Poetry, 1800-2000*.

[45] Tonra notes that some reviewers, such as Rev. John Eyre, accused Moore of exaggerating the sensual content of Anacreon's originals (553).

Moore appears to draw on this game of attribution as he develops his satiric career, although in the earlier, Juvenalian satires, Moore's actual presence in the text is subordinated by his Irish identity. This sense of identity is a means of protection, as Moore attempts to shield himself from judgment by hiding (verbally) within a collective national identity, and instead focuses his poems on uncovering or unhiding the misdeeds and hidden past of the English government. The first of these poems, *Corruption and Intolerance*, were published wholly anonymously, a more stringent protective measure considering their content and one justified by the increased scrutiny of the press through anti-sedition measures. Despite the passage of time since the failed Rebellion of 1798, Moore still regarded such political writings as an act of "rebellion," as indicated in his letter to Lady Donegal. Given his knowledge of the outcomes of such rebellions, Moore's increased caution is understandable. However, this decision likely also contributed to the lack of attention the verses received. As Tonra and Lee Erikson point out, the popularity of anonymous publication declined drastically between the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, largely due to the reading public's desire for an authorial subject. Erickson in particular points to the public's unwillingness to buy works from an unnamed author. As Moore states in his Preface to the third volume, "These attempts of mine in the stately Juvenalian style of satire, met with but little success, -- never having attained, I believe, even the honors of a second edition" (160). Moore was only slightly incorrect, as Kelly notes that *Corruption* actually did achieve a second edition (74), but in the shadow of Moore's attributed works, the first two volumes of *Irish Melodies*, the satires received lesser attention than their lyrical counterparts. Criticism (favorable and unfavorable) typically aligned along political divides, with the Tory-based *Anti-Jacobin Review* going so far as to insinuate that the politics expressed in the works were just as likely the product of someone suffering from insanity as from an Irishman (J. Moore 20-21), a comment that actually maligns the

whole of the Irish nation as irrational, one of the key arguments for denying Irish home rule. In light of such criticisms, Moore's choice to publish anonymously protected his better-known public persona as the author of such works as *Irish Melodies*, since the appearance of radical political ties and accusations of irrationality would have harmed his reputation among the social elite who provided the majority of his patronage.[46]

While anonymity most likely played a part in the lack of critical acknowledgement of the poems, the hard-hitting Juvenalian style employed within the verses also works to alienate potential English readers, undermining the possibility of English support for Irish home rule. Moore subtitles *Corruption and Intolerance*, "Two Poems: Addressed to an Englishman by an Irishman," the only occasion on which Moore makes a direct appearance in the poem, hidden behind the anonymity provided by "Irishman," a vague alias that draws attention to the nationalities involved rather than individual actors. In the original Preface, he also criticizes the Glorious Revolution of 1688 as the source of Ireland's oppression, but his criticism here revolves around the same complaints he leveled at America in *Epistles, Odes, and Other Poems*: "the failure of revolution to deliver the promised salvation" (J. Moore, 18). His subtitle situates the work within the frame of an epistolary format, a satiric tradition Steven Shelburne traces through Elizabethan satire to the classical satiric tradition, and in particular Cicero's *Laelius de Amicitia* and its classical ideas about

[46] Notwithstanding, scholarly attention since then has been lacking, with critics such as Gary Dyer and Jane Moody preferring to focus on works such as *The Two-penny Postbag* and *The Fudge Family in Paris*. In retrospect, Moore seems to blame the Juvenalian mode for the satires' lack of popularity by contrasting them with his later works. He says that "I found that lighter form of weapon, to which I afterwards betook myself, not only more easy to wield, but, from its very lightness, perhaps, more sure to reach its mark" (160), a nod to the more jovial, Horatian tone of *The Two-Penny Post Bag* and *The Fudge Family in Paris*. Yet there are other differences between the works. Whereas in *Corruption and Intolerance*, Moore writes from within the framework of a classical satiric tradition under a wholly anonymous authorship, in the latter satires he breaks from this mode by incorporating elements of contemporary literary media and culture while employing a pseudynonymous authorship and paratextual framestories for the satires.

friendship and the "ideal ethos of amity" (136) in satire. However, even as the epistolary format would appear to invite dialogue between the speaker and his readers, the English public, Moore's Juvenalian vituperation leaves little good will between the speaker and the target audience by drawing attention to the cultural, political, and, more importantly, power divisions between England and Ireland. In his Preface, he says:

> But however an Englishman might be reproached with ingratitude, for depreciating the merits and results of a measure, which he is taught to regard as the source of his liberties...yet an Irishman, who has none of these obligations to acknowledge; to whose country the Revolution brought nothing but injury and insult, and who recollects that the book of Molyneux was burned, by order of William's Whig Parliament, for daring to extend to unfortunate Ireland those principles on which the revolution was professedly founded – an Irishman *may* be allowed to criticize freely the measures of that period, without exposing himself either to the imputation of ingratitude, or to the suspicion of being influenced by any Popish remains of Jacobitism (22).

With this statement, Moore reveals an inherently hypocritical construct of patriotism in which loyalty to the nation, Great Britain, is determined by upholding the tenants of freedom embodied in an event that systematically stripped a portion of the population of its rights. While the English regard the Glorious Revolution as the root of their freedoms, Moore blatantly reminds the reader of the ways in which the Revolution also specifically and deliberately denied those same rights to Ireland by recalling the work of William Molyneux, a seventeenth-century political philosopher whose *The Case of Ireland* advocated against English occupation and subjugation of the Irish nation.

Although Moore takes issue with the events of 1688 in order to attack the ongoing anti-Catholic and anti-Irish discrimination that is only thinly veiled as political safeguards of the British state, his statements bear relevance on the more recent Act of Union of 1801, in which Ireland was forcibly and officially subsumed into the British state. Since the act, according to Evan Gottlieb, "took place against a backdrop of violence and when England was already an imperial power, the terms of the Irish Union were decidedly colonial in nature" (15). Ina Ferris discusses this issue at length in the Introduction to *The Romantic National Tale and the Question of Ireland* when she points to the inherent tensions revealed by the name given to the new nation after the Act of Union, The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. This name, she says:

> "adumbrates a dilemma: Ireland is at once a part of the kingdom (a political subject) but not a part of Great Britain (not a national subject). Where the names of Scotland and England have been resolved into the larger unity of Great Britain, holding out the possibility of both preserving and assimilating national difference, Ireland stands within the union but outside the unity, ambiguously attached through vague coordination: 'and Ireland'" (1-2).

She also claims that such coordination creates an Ireland that belongs "not to a national identity but to a political unit. It names no 'imagined community' […] to command affection or allegiance, while its cumbersome articulation testifies to its provenance in the musty and dubious sphere of parliamentary legislation" (1). This lack of community, affection, or allegiance is brought to the forefront in Moore's Preface and subtitle, both in his use of the individual demonyms, which underscore the nationalistic differences behind the political unity, as well as when Moore attempts to turn the reader's sense of moral indignation in favor of the disempowered Irish people when he references the Act of Settlement and the systematic disenfranchisement of the Catholic, and

thereby Irish, citizens of the combined nation. This attempt to rouse the reader's righteous anger falls firmly in line with satiric tradition, but the bitterly Juvenalian tone of the piece overwhelms any indications of sentiment that may have been carried over from the *Irish Melodies*. It does, however, indicate a rhetorical similarity that contains that potential for sentiment, which Moore uses more successfully in his later, more Horatian satires.[47]

The hard-hitting Juvenalian tone of the satire and the lack of sentiment seen in the Preface and poem body are largely made possible by the totally anonymous nature of the work. Without the shadowy presence of his recognized authorial persona, Moore is able to attack the injustices of the British government more straightforwardly. It is from this position of personal anonymity that he endeavors to draw the wrongdoings of the government into the public eye, a revelation he accomplishes by means of the image that starts in line 17 of Ireland and Great Britain as "wedded countries." Although this domestic representation ultimately becomes one of sexual unfaithfulness, i.e. corruption, as the poem develops, it also allows Moore to play with the concept of "vice" from several angles. The first of such angles is the act of sedition on the part of the author, which, according to Donelan, came to be regarded as a vice during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries thanks to the activities of organizations such as the Society for the Suppression of Vice who regarded defiance of the government as an immoral act worthy of censure. Yet the anonymity of the poem relegates this so-called misdeed to the background, as the inability to name an author leaves the audience with no target to accuse.

[47] I am reserving discussion of *Intolerance*, since Moore closes his Preface with only a brief paragraph mention of the poem, which he describes as "the imperfect beginnings of a long series of Essays with which I here menace my readers upon the same important subject" (23). Moore's emphasis on the lasting effects of 1688 in the Preface reveals that the majority of Moore's political argument is presented in *Corruption*. However, *Intolerance* reiterates the religious discrimination against Catholics enacted by the British government and is closely related to the argument presented in *The Sceptic*.

Instead, the metaphor brings the vices of the government into public view as Moore begins the satire by bewailing Ireland's "wrongs and slights" (11) in the face of "Britain's glorious rights" (12), a continuation of the argument waged in the preface. He then ends the first stanza with the statement that "I coldly listen to thy patriot vaunts; / And feel, though close our wedded countries twine, / More sorrow for my own than pride from thine" (16-18). Moore again highlights the misguided definitions of patriotism prevalent in political discourse at the time, but his description of the Union as "wedded countries" draws attention to the unequal balance of power created by the Act of Union. In this metaphor, Moore draws on the historic feminization of Ireland through bardic traditions such as the figure of neglected "Mother Ireland" or as an *aisling*, or "dream vision,"[48, 49] in order to represent the Irish nation as the metaphorical bride of Great Britain. Yet the bride's marriage to an occupying government robs the traditional representation of the *aisling* of its primarily positive connotations of patriotism and love of nation and instead focuses on the negatives of powerlessness and hopeless expectation. By framing the Union as a conjugal, i.e. a "wedded" relationship, Moore draws on a tradition of feminine and domestic representations of the Irish nation in public discourse as a way of asserting patriarchal authority over the colonized state through cultural marginalization and disempowerment.[50]

---

[48] See Edna O'Brien, Declan Kieberd, Guinn Batten, Moynagh Sullivan, and Murray Pittock, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism.*

[49] Scholars such as Adele Dalsimer and Vera Kreilkamp, and Belinda Loftus argue that the "native iconography" found in these traditions creates a gendered national identity, while others such as Luke Gibbons and Joseph Valente explain the identification of Ireland with the feminine as a byproduct of contemporary attitudes and a justification of colonialism (Davis 12-13). Valente argues that "Nineteenth-century imperialism relied for much of its ideological strength upon normative tropologies of gender disjunction, exclusion, and stratification. [Which figured] the conquerors as the exponents of a principle coded and celebrated as masculine…and the conquered as the embodiment of a principle stereotyped and discounted as female…" (Valente).

[50] This rhetoric would become increasingly visible as the century drew on, as evidenced in Gibbons, Valente and C.L. Innes's comprehensive examinations of the mid- and late-century feminization of Ireland in popular political cartoons such as *Punch*. Innes states significantly that representations of Ireland were "likely to stress racial similarities, as befits a desirable wife or daughter whose relationship with England is to be a domestic one" (14) and that Ireland's "salvation lies in her rescue and 'marriage' to her English father/husband, whose benevolent and

Moore uses the rhetorical feminization of Ireland to underscore the inherent corruption in the Act of Union and the occupation of Ireland since the relationship between Ireland and Great Britain is, in actuality, more that of a mistress than a wife, a subtle echo of the phrase "Great Britain *and* Ireland", as he also describes a feminized English nation as separate from the masculinized structure of government, a distinction that plays an important role in the development of Moore's argument. The English nation, not Ireland, is the proper "bride" of the political structure, thus voiding the legitimacy of the marriage/Act of Union and revealing the government's true concerns in upholding the interests of the English nation, not the outlying constituents of the larger British state. Although Moore frames the satire as a critique of the Glorious Revolution, the satire becomes grounded in the present via the image of the "wedded countries" and its striking parallels to the Prince of Wales's marriage(s) and extra-marital affairs, starting with his illicit, and invalid, marriage in 1785 to his Catholic mistress, Maria Fitzherbert. Throughout the poem, Moore freely attacks both Tories and English Whigs for their role in the injustices committed against Ireland, but the Prince is a particularly problematic target for the satire given his known alliances with the Whig party and his professed support of Catholic Emancipation. While the metaphor lacks a true one-to-one correspondence with the Prince's state of affairs, the similarities reflect both the macro- and microcosms of the political situation as Ireland prefigured as the bride of Great Britain symbolizes on the one side the whole of the Irish people and on the other side represents Fitzherbert. By transitive association, the Prince's ill-treated mistress becomes symbolic of the Irish people, while

---

patriarchal governance will allow her to fulfill her essential self and remain feminine and Celtic" (15). Valente and Innes also point to mid- and late-nineteenth-century discussions of colonialism in which the Celtic races are identified as feminine in nature, and that "the Irish, like women in general, were constitutionally ill-equipped for the dispassionate pursuit of state and social policy and were for that reason properly dispossessed of any real historical agency" (Valente).

the illegality of the marriage reflects the perceived illegitimacy of British rule over Ireland. The details of the Prince's private life, in particular the illicit marriage, are thereby dragged into public view once again and re-politicized in the context of the Irish question, just as Moore also uncovers the injustices carried out against Ireland under the screen of "legitimate" government rule.

Moore continues to illustrate the dangers of such an improper alliance when the extended metaphor ultimately compares the Irish nation to a "fallen woman." He ends the satire with the ominous statement that the unjust treatment of the Irish people "Made Ireland first, in wild adulterous trance, / Turn false to England's bed and whore with France!" (205-206).[51] The essence of Ireland, envisioned as a female, has become corrupted, tainted, and ruined by a foreign political structure, just as a woman coerced into a sexual relationship outside of marriage would be "ruined" socially and, with no prospects of legitimate marriage (or in this case, self-governance), be forced into prostitution (in the form of an alliance with France) for survival. Although Fitzherbert remained faithful to the Prince until his death, Moore's suggestion of impending ruin recalls the ways in which Fitzherbert's reputation suffered in the wake of the marriage. Initial reactions to the illicit marriage garnered Fitzherbert a mixed reception in polite society despite her efforts to maintain the image of propriety (Irvine 46-47), and Fitzherbert felt her reputation had been irrevocably harmed by Charles Fox's vehement denunciation of the marriage as "base and scandalous calumny" (qtd in Irvine 52).[52] Even though the denial gained Fitzherbert a great deal of sympathy, she reacted by claiming that Fox had knowingly "rolled her in the kennel like a streetwalker" (Fraser 7), since the public denials

[51] *Corruption and Intolerance* were only published unedited, in their entirety once. This line in particular, was drastically edited between the version given here, which was the original couplet, and the version that appeared in Moore's collected works and read: "Drove Ireland first to turn, with harlot glance,/ Tow'rds other shores, and woo th' embrace of France."

[52] Although Fox had repeatedly advised against the marriage, he was apparently unaware of the actual truth of the matter. Both Irvine and Smith note that Fox, once confronted by Fitzherbert's uncle, Henry Errington, was appalled that he had been deceived into lying to the House of Commons and apparently cooled his relationship with the Prince. (Irvine 53, Smith 43).

of the marriage cast her openly as the Prince's mistress (Smith 42). Thus, Moore's metaphor draws on recent social memory of the scandal, using the wronged Fitzherbert to paint Ireland as the wronged woman and the British government as the treacherous spouse. This rhetorical move ideally would transfer the force of public sympathy from Fitzherbert to Ireland and its Catholic population, thereby rallying support for Catholic Emancipation and Irish independence.

This image further parallels the Prince's marital issues when Moore introduces the second "woman" in his metaphor, the feminized spirit of the English nation, which corresponds to the Prince's legal wife, Caroline of Brunswick. One of the Prince's primary reasons for denying the marriage to Fitzherbert was his mounting personal debt, a debt that was only satisfied through an increase in personal allowance granted after the Prince's Parliament-approved marriage to Caroline. Moore accomplishes this latter connection by first building more criticism of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 in which he subsequently portrays the feminized essence of England as being vulnerable to governmental corruption in the same manner as Ireland:

> Turn while I tell how England's freedom found,
> Where most she look't for life, her deadliest wound;
> How brave she struggled while her foe was seen,
> How faint since Influence lent that foe a screen;
> How strong o'er James and Popery she prevailed,
> How weakly fell when Whigs and gold assailed. (29-34)

The first two lines reiterate the argument from the Preface that 1688 formed an incomplete Revolution by only granting rights to a portion of the population while eliminating rights for Irish Catholics, a policy that is the direct cause of the ongoing conflict between Ireland and Great Britain. This struggle against Catholicism is described in seemingly favorable terms in lines 31 and 33, with

the words "brave" and "strong", where Moore seems to frame James II and the male-dominated Catholic church as England's opponents. Thus, the "brave struggle" is first suggestive of England resisting a male outsider, an act that, combined with the sexual motif of the poem, suggests thwarted sexual violence, and thus her struggle becomes a battle to preserve female virtue. On the other hand, the mention of the Catholic church also recalls the way in which the Prince disavowed Fitzherbert, reflecting England/Caroline's momentary triumph over her rival. This victory, however, is clouded by Moore's references to "influence," and "gold," imagery that suggests not only the literal greed and power-grabbing of the political climate, but also a courtship based on self-interest and personal gain, a relationship subject to disintegrate when one or both of the parties involved find better prospects elsewhere. Later, in the poem, Moore uses similar language to describe government corruption in terms that are suggestive of prostitution when he says that:

> Sly Prerogative like Jove of old,
> Has turned his thunder into showers of gold
> Whose silent courtship wins securer joys,
> Taints by degrees, and ruins without noise. (79-82)

In these two sections, references to money and courtship combined with the words "taint" and "ruin" portray a feminine essence of the English nation that is in danger of being corrupted and prostituted from within by "the men who ruined [Ireland]" (192).

This emphasis on money and financial gain closely mimics the courtship between the Prince and Caroline of Brunswick, particularly as it focuses on the fallout of such a relationship. The Prince, as stated, married primarily for the increase in personal allowance, while Caroline, at age twenty-six, may have seen the marriage as the last chance to avoid spinsterhood.[53] The subsequent

[53] Smith implies this when he notes the lack of other apparent suitors (71).

"corruption" hinted at in the satire reflects the ways in which Caroline was ultimately neglected, spurned, and maligned by the Prince as he plainly kept his mistress, Lady Jersey, in Caroline's company, bickered over custody arrangements of Princess Charlotte, and opened formal inquiries into the Princess's conduct as a means of discrediting her complaints. As had been the case with Fitzherbert, the Prince's conduct toward Caroline spawned a growing trend of popular sympathy for the Princess, who, though regarded as somewhat brusque and uneducated, had quickly become a public favorite, in contrast to the spendthrift and extravagant Prince. As of the satire's publication in 1808, the Prince's regency, subsequent abandonment of Whig politics, and fall from favor with Whig politicians had not yet occurred and Moore still conducted himself as a public supporter of the Prince as Ireland's hope for freedom. However, the correspondence between the metaphor and politics is not totally untenable: the poem carries ominous undertones that act as reasonable warning rather than mere predictions, since the Prince's actions in the Fitzherbert affair created a rift between the Prince and several close friends and political allies (Smith, 43).[54] As Moore's poem reminds the reader of these recent scandals, it also serves to unearth the political implications of the Prince's private conduct, particularly as that conduct hints toward the Prince's capacity for political faithlessness.

Moore reserves the remainder of the poem for criticizing various prominent politicians, past and present, both English and Irish, such as William Pitt, Samuel Birch, Lord Castlereagh, Spencer Perceval, and others, in more general terms for their loyalty to the British state in the face of such injustices. His severest critique in this vein, however, refers to the so-called Irish patriots as "destin'd for those Eastern reigns / When eunuchs flourisht, and such nerveless things / As men

[54] In particular, Smith cites Charles Grey's refusal to contradict Fox's statement as one of the leading causes that "[drew] him as Regent into the arms of the Tories" (43).

rejected were the chosen of kings" (178-180), a description that underscores the servile nature as well as political impotence of those persons who refused to speak out against the corrupt practices of British government officials. Moore's unfavorable comparison between patriots and eunuchs essentially dares his readers to identify with the British government and their attempts to undermine and disempower the Irish; however, Moore also shows not only the perversion of a patriotism that upholds the interests of the state at the expense of the people, but also the inevitable decline and death of an empire based on a system of nationalist favoritism. Moore moves from the image of corrupt marriages to one of nullified sexual expression, lacking virility as well as fertility, symbolizing the state's inability to continue under the support of men who are unable to provide for the future development of the nation as a whole. This critical portrayal of patriotism also highlights the ways in which Ireland's ability to rule itself is called into question, as those who accept British rule as-is and profess patriotism are emasculated and unworthy of self-government.

Moore's evident willingness to name leading politicians seems in contrast to his apparent reluctance to name Prince George within the text of the satire. This can be explained, however, by the Prince's status as a member of the royal household, specifically being his position as the heir to George III and next in line for the throne. Despite the fact that the events surrounding his marriages were by and large public knowledge, references to the Prince and his wives remain coded behind the metaphor of the "wedded countries." This coding exemplifies the enhanced precautions taken with the satire, as more direct references to the Prince's misdeeds and moral (if not legal) bigamy could have resulted in more strenuous efforts to unearth the satire's author in order to prosecute for seditious libel. Moore's analogy reminds the reading public of scandals past and then recasts these events in such a way that they are not only re-politicized, but also contain the potential to harm the Prince's career through the implications of political disloyalty played out in the analogy.

For this reason, revealing Moore's authorship at best would have cost him his patronage; at worst, it could have pushed Moore afoul of the Treasonous Practices Act of 1795. The Act focused on the physical protection of the king and his heirs in the wake of a stoning incident in 1795, but included a secondary clause focused on seditious writings. This clause allowed for transportation of those convicted of creating writings designed to incite political unrest aimed toward the government, with a provision that allowed for increasing the sentence for crimes in which the statues of seditious libel also applied. Although Moore's poem attempts to drag government wrongdoing before the public view, the risk to his personal liberty and financial well-being drive the necessity for anonymity, costing Moore and his poem the benefits of credibility garnered by his established reputation as a literary and social favorite within the realms of the society elite.

Whereas *Corruption* focused primarily on the political issues surrounding the conflict between England and Ireland, in the accompanying poem, *Intolerance*, Moore concentrates more fully on the religious issues underpinning the longstanding struggle, which he accomplishes by first pushing Ireland momentarily to the background in order to highlight England's hidden or forgotten Catholic past rather than its Protestant present. Published together with Moore's *Corruption*, which ends on the line "Oh England! Sinking England! Boast no more" (302), *Intolerance* begins with the reader's attention fixed on England and the looming dangers of political corruption. Moore opens the poem with an epigraph from Joseph Addison's *Freeholder*, which states, "This clamour, which pretends to be raised for the safety of Religion, has almost worn out the very appearance of it, and rendered us not only the most divided but the most immoral people upon the face of the earth" (37). The emphasis here on "division," combined with the lingering reminder of England draws the reader's attention to national divisions based not on differences in political state, but on differences in religion. Here, the bulk of Moore's argument is found in his notes accompanying the poem, as

opposed to the verse itself, an important distinction as the Juvenalian vituperation of the verse appears divisive, whereas the notes clearly work to build a sense of sympathy and solidarity between Catholics and Protestants in England and Ireland, reserving the heat of his argument for the political figures responsible for the bulk of Irish oppression.

In the first note accompanying line 4, he upbraids the named political figures on the basis of their celebration of the democratic principles and limitations on monarchial authority that resulted from the Revolution of 1688, while also steadfastly ignoring the role of Catholic influence in obtaining those principles. He states:

> When Englishmen, therefore, say that Popery is the religion of slavery, they should not only recollect that their boasted Constitution is the work and bequest of Popish ancestors; they should not only remember the laws of Edward III. 'under whom (says Bolingbroke) the constitution of our Parliaments, and the whole form of our Government, became reduced into better form'; but they should know that even the errors of Popery have leaned to the cause of liberty, and that Papists, however mistaken their motives may have been, were the first promulgators of the doctrine which led to the Revolution. (4n)

While the figures named in the body of the satire make clear that Moore's ultimate topic is the oppression of the Irish, his note is worthy of consideration for the breakdown of national lines in favor of religious solidarity. In the note, Ireland is never mentioned specifically; instead, Moore raises the specter of England's own Catholic past, particularly in his recollection of the Catholic King Edward III and his contributions to the current political well-being of England. He goes on to argue the ways in which more recent political history has selectively represented Catholic involvement in order to justify Catholic oppression and ends with the statement that, "In short, nothing can better

illustrate the misery of those shifts and evasions by which a long course of cowardly injustice may be supported, than the whole history of Great Britain's conduct toward the Catholic part of her empire" (4n). The phrase not only draws attention to the colonial nature of the relationship between England and Ireland, but also, following the reference to Edward III, effectively reminds the reader that there are English as well as Irish Catholics. By re-dividing the British population along religious rather than national lines, Moore highlights the ways in which Catholic oppression, typically targeted along national divisions, actually harms the empire as a whole. This tactic draws attention to the political unit and not the national components that comprise Great Britain in order to further a sense of solidarity and unity among his English and Irish readers.

The aggressive tone of the verse, however, at first appears to undercut the sense of solidarity built in his notes, particularly when Moore returns to his theme of religious injustice and hypocrisy. However, his acrimony is targeted once again at the government, and not the general citizenry. In the body of the poem, he first mentions Ireland directly in line 20 and 26 before he decries "Ireland's slavery, and … Ireland's woes" (35), then seems to prophecy the eventual freedom of Ireland while "the memory of her tyrant foes / Shall but exist, all future knaves to warn, / Embalm'd in hate, and canoniz'd by scorn!" (36-38). He proceeds to "name and shame" (J. Moore 19) key English political figures for their roles in the aftermath of the Irish Rebellion and their continued work in promotion of anti-Catholic legislation. In the first forty lines of the poem, he names Patrick Dugenan, Spencer Perceval, and Lord Haweksbury, as well as Lord Castlereagh, all supporters of anti-Catholic legislation on the grounds of staunch Protestant beliefs, but pays particular attention to Hawkesbury, who claimed Catholic Emancipation was incompatible with the laws and constitution of Great Britain (J. Moore, 429-430:153n). Likewise, Moore names Foreign Secretary George Canning for his "vapours" (19), or what Moore believed was mere lip service to

the cause of Catholic relief (429:152n). He develops his argument chiefly on the force of the names raised, names that provide the list of "tyrant foes" mentioned in line 36. Although he conforms to the cryptographic convention of replacing vowels with dashes to disguise the names of his targets, the deeds and misdeeds of the individuals are immortalized in the satire. The disguising of names is merely a formality, as the actions detailed leave little room for doubt as to the identities of the persons indicated. Just as the primary metaphor of *Corruption* draws on the public's recent memory of Prince George's marital transgressions, Moore relies on his audience's familiarity with the events to which he alludes. His prediction that these names will serve as warning to "future knaves" essentially reverses the warning given at the end of *Corruption* when he cautions England to be wary of political betrayal and self-interest, and instead envisages the downfall of that same corrupt government.

Moore vehemently denounces these political figures when he describes them and the English government as armed with "prayerbooks and with whips" (59) and boldly states that

> I'd rather have been born, ere man was blest
> With the pure dawn of Revelation's light,
> Yes!—Rather plunge me back in Pagan night,
> And take my chance with Socrates for bliss,
> Than be a Christian of a faith like this. (66-70)

As Juvenalian satire, Moore's tone effectively communicates the weight of moral indignation and outrage appropriate to his purpose; however, the declaration to accept paganism over a corrupt (Protestant) Christianity at first appears to engender more of a divide between his Catholic and Protestant readership in the verse, although Moore's notes make clear that his target is solely the political actors responsible for carrying out legalized oppression. In his notes to line 59, Moore

draws attention to arguments presented against Catholics of "closing the door of salvation upon others" (59n) while pointing out that several branches of Protestant theology do the same. However, he actually credits the lay Christian and the "honest clergyman" (59n) with more charitable views on salvation, while at the end of the note striking back at those who uphold outdated and unmerciful tenets. In particular, he attacks Spencer Perceval, who is only identified in this note and the note accompanying line 69 by his title, Chancellor of the Exchequer. He refers to Perceval as a "dabbler" (59n) in theology and "[takes] the liberty of recommending these *notiae* upon damnation to the particular attention of the learned Chancellor of the Exchequer" (69n). Whereas Moore references his targets in verse using the method of dashes to hide names, in the notes he takes no such precautions, openly exposing his targets and their religious bigotry to public scorn. The good will fostered between Catholics and Protestants in the notes unites the civilian citizenry against a common enemy, creating an "us and them" divide, not between Catholics and Protestants (where such a divide would be largely expected), but between the common population and government officials. In this way, Moore attempts to build sympathy between Catholics and Protestants, Irish and English, in such a way that the government dishonesty exposed in *Corruption* becomes a religious as well as a moral failing that all citizens have, in his view, a Christian duty to combat. By virtue of his anonymous authorship, Moore's identity fades in with the masses of Catholics and Protestants that he is attempting to influence.

The Sceptic

Although Moore's initial plan to compose *Intolerance* as the first in a series of essays may have been abandoned, his third anonymous Juvenalian satire, *The Sceptic* (1809), appears to share many of the same stylistic and thematic features as its predecessors and functions as a cumulative

effort in uncovering the culpability of the individual to combat oppression. The poem appeared under the designation "by the author of *Corruption and Intolerance*" (J. Moore 46), an attribution that links the three poems in series yet, as with the previous poems, leaves the identity of the author entirely hidden. As was the case with the other satires, this anonymity provides the dual function of protecting Moore from accusations of sedition and drawing attention away from the author in order to focus on the reader's relationship with the government being criticized. Moore cultivates the relationship with his audience across the three poems by moving from bitter Juvenalian invective in *Corruption,* to a difference in tone between invective targeted at political figures in the body of *Intolerance* and more conciliatory language aimed at his general audience in the notes, and finally to a more empathetic and understanding tone toward the general populace, particularly non-political Protestants, in *The Sceptic*. This progressive de-escalation of tone is perhaps the reason Moore's contemporaries, and many scholars since, have considered the work to have "a weaker satirical bite than the former poems" (J. Moore 47). Because of this perception, the poem has garnered little critical attention, although it appears to have attracted a small cluster of articles in the early twentieth century mainly dealing with the relationship between Moore's Catholic faith and the philosophy of scepticism,[55] but no significant academic study since. While Moore puts forth many of the same arguments made in *Intolerance* relating to religious hypocrisy, in *The Sceptic* he uses an emphasis on scepticism to encourage his audience, the general members of the populace, to question their own political and religious beliefs to uncover the inherent inequity of the government's actions against Ireland and Catholics.

[55] Hennig, John. "Thomas Moore and the Holy Alliance." *The Irish Monthly*, 1946.
Brogan, Howard O. "Thomas Moore, Irish Satirist and Keeper of the English Conscience". *Philological Quarterly*, XXIV, no. 3, July 1945.

Whereas in the previous poems, the theme of hiding and revealing is merely implied by anonymous authorship and cryptographic naming, in *The Sceptic* Moore's argument takes a more direct approach in his reliance on sensory imagery and analogies related to sight and seeing. He opens the poem with a list of various sensory images, yet the first and most often referenced of these is sight, with the mention of "vision" in line 2. With these images, he emphasizes the sceptic's distrust of sensory information, particularly as such skepticism reveals the underlying instability and unreliability of religious and political opinions. Moore first accomplishes this shift in his opening by demonstrating the value of cultural subjectivity on opinions of beauty and morals. He declares:

> So when, with heartfelt tribute, we declare
> That Marco's honest and that Susan's fair
> 'tis in our minds, and not in Susan's eyes
> Or Marco's life, the worth or beauty lies (5-8)

These lines are quickly met, however, by sceptic rebuttal and comparison:

> For she, in flat-nos'd China, would appear
> As plain a thing as Lady Anne is here;
> And one light joke at rich Loretto's dome
> Would rank good Marco with the damn'd at Rome. (9-12)

The juxtaposition of the two instances provides a common example, as his readers will readily agree that standards of beauty differ according to culturally influenced aesthetic values; yet, Moore's counter-examples of China and Rome are clearly described as less-desirable to his audience, simultaneously acknowledging difference and dismissing it. More importantly, however, Moore creates a parallel between beauty, a quality perceived with the senses, versus morality, an attribute observed and judged on more intellectual grounds, opening the way for his later arguments

regarding political opinion, which he begins at lines 21-24. He introduces this more political line of inquiry when he declares that there may be some "monstrous region / […] Where [Castlereagh] would for a patriot pass, / And mouthing [Mulgrave] scarce be deem'd an ass!" The construction of the verse places this "monstrous region" in the same undesirable space as the "flat-nos'd China" of Moore's previous example, creating for the reader a sense of right and wrong through political alliance, an alliance intended to gain sympathy for the Irish public. Moore's targets comprise two key figures of the Pittite administration, both supporters of the Act of Union of 1801, who received the brunt of political scorn from supporters of Irish rights and Catholic emancipation. Castlereagh in particular had been a key participant in pursuing and prosecuting the leaders of the Irish Rebellion, even though he widely supported leniency for commoners associated with the rebellion and claimed to support measures for Catholic emancipation in general. Moore's sarcasm here aligns his satire with the interests of his Irish audience by implying that Castlereagh and Mulgrave are both widely detested, and that any views to the contrary are not only unlikely, but foreign and undesirable, i.e. "monstrous." Such a description plays to the audience in support of Irish independence while shaming and silencing the opposition as unreasonable and immoral for supporting Castlereagh and Mulgrave.

As his argument progresses, Moore demonstrates the ways in which these beliefs, aesthetic, moral, and political, are shaped according to cultural norms and other factors such as self-interest. He explains the source of this influence by contrasting the tenets of Epicurean and Sceptic philosophies: Epicurean philosophy claims, he says, "'List not to reason,' … 'but trust the senses, *there* conviction lies'" (25-26) while scepticism, asserts, "Just as the mind the erring sense believes, /The erring mind, in turn, the sense deceives" (33-34). In a physical, if oversimplified, sense, the Epicurean disciple would rely on pleasurable or otherwise positive sensory information to assert

principles of good or bad, but in an intellectual sense, the equivalent of such a philosophy is ascribing to attitudes and ideas that primarily support one's own advantage or privilege, and likewise to assert that such values are universally applicable. Moore demonstrates this argument when he says that "Self is the medium least refined of all" (41) and "[Paine] perhaps, for something snug per ann., / Had laugh'd, like [Wellesley], at all Rights of Man!" (51-52). His emphasis on positive sensory experience in the earlier Epicurean examples, combined with the prominence of financial advantage in his hypothetical example of Paine, suggests the ways in which opinions and beliefs of those in power are both shaped by and refined in a way that protects the privilege provided to the individual by the system currently in place. Thus, Moore chips away at the reliability of sensory information, and by extension the reliability of opinion, by demonstrating the influence of external factors, such as cultural standards, and internal factors, such as habit and self-interest, in the formation of these beliefs.

Previously named figures, such as Wellesley and Pain suggest the prominence (or prominent danger) of such ideas among the political elite, yet this line of argument opens the reader up to skeptical questioning of the assumptions underpinning their own core beliefs and values, particularly those that reflect more widely-held political opinions, such as attitudes toward the Catholic and Irish populations of Great Britain. He states that:

> But 'tis not only individual minds
> That habit tinctures, or that interest blinds;
> Whole nations, fool'd by falsehood, fear, or pride,
> Their ostrich-heads in self-illusion hide (53-56).[56]

[56] J. Moore notes that these lines are significantly altered in Moore's later *Poetical Works*: line 54 is altered to read "Whole nations, too, the same delusion blinds," while lines 55 and 56 are deleted entirely (435n39-40).

He starts off with a contrast between the "individual minds" of line 53 and the "whole nations" of line 55), establishing the existence of national opinion based on those same fallacies of habit and self-interest that taint more commonplace views on beauty and morality. In these lines, as elsewhere in the poem, "sight" takes on the somewhat standard metaphorical interpretation of mental clarity or understanding. Here though, he specifically relies on sensory imagery relating to a lack of sight to frame his argument against narrow-minded views. He does this first through the poetic structure, as the ending rhymes place minds/blinds and pride/hide in prime locations. Each pairing emphasizes the ways in which attitudes and beliefs can be distorted by matters of self-interest, what Moore terms in line 56 "self-illusion," another reference to lack of metaphorical clear-sightedness. The line ending also emphasizes the vice of "pride" above "fear" and "falsehood," compounding the severity of such assumptions as matters of moral failing that are, significantly, attributed to the nation as a whole. Additionally, Moore's use of "ostrich-heads" suggests that this "self-illusion" is a deliberate unwillingness to "see" an alternate point of view that might challenge the reader's current perception of the world. From this perspective, he targets his English readership in order to encourage (or goad, as the case of satire might be) them to re-evaluate their prejudices toward the Irish and Irish home rule.

The difference between the "individual minds" and "whole nations" of the previous section also suggests a shift between the individual citizen and the national or political body, particularly as those individuals named throughout the poem consist of prominent political actors. While Moore accuses his common English readership of deliberately turning a blind eye to the injustices against Ireland, his criticism formally turns to the government when he juxtaposes British responses to both domestic and foreign affairs in order to uncover political and religious hypocrisy by the administration. In lines 57-62, he contrasts British involvement in foreign affairs in both Denmark

and Spain, as well as the government's response to the Irish Uprising and the cruel treatment of insurrectionists in its aftermath:

> Thus England, hot from Denmark's smoking meads,
> Turns up her eyes at Gallia's guilty deeds;
> The, selfish still, the same dishonouring chain
> She binds in Ireland, she would break in Spain;
> While prais'd at distance, but at home forbid,
> Rebels in Cork are patriots at Madrid! (57-62).

This triangulation of events in Denmark, Ireland, and Spain reveals the ways in which British actions are dominated by self-interest rather than the interests of liberty or equality, beginning with England's seizure of the Danish fleet in the Battle of Copenhagen in 1807. The seizure protected English trade interests against a pending invasion of Denmark (an otherwise neutral country) by Napoleon's troops (J. Moore 435n41). Britain's support of Spanish rebels in their bid to overthrow French invaders also responds to a threat against English trade from Napoleon's forces, part of his campaign to implement the Continental System that specifically tried to limit British trade with French occupied or French allied nations. Thus, both instances of foreign involvement might be seen as actions undertaken to protect the British nation, particularly against the specific threat waged by Napoleon. Yet Moore interjects the conflict with Ireland between the two examples in an effort to reveal Britain's true motivations. These motivations are demonstrated by the proximity of references to Ireland and Denmark, which suggests a relationship between these two countries, one that demonstrates the willingness of British officials to undermine or ignore the sovereignty of other nations in favor of their own political goals.

Moore then transitions to discussing the contrast between Ireland and Spain, a comparison borne out by what he sees as "the same dishonouring chain" of oppression, since both nations endure the occupation of foreign governments. This "chain" creates grounds for a more direct comparison between the two, yet his verse highlights the differences in British reactions to the uprising, noting the distinction between "rebels" in Ireland and "patriots" in Spain. He specifically uses the phrases "rebels at home" to refer to the Irish insurgents and "prais'd at distance" to describe the Spanish revolutionaries, phrases that point out the perspective behind the label bestowed. As England directly suffers the effects of Irish rebellion, those actors are termed "rebels" and regarded with utmost scorn, whereas Britain experiences no direct consequences and in fact benefits from the Spanish rebellion, thereby bestowing a positive and encouraging label. Additionally, although Moore's argument to this point is largely bereft of any discussion of the religious principles set forth in the satire's Preface, this self-serving partiality is also demonstrated in the contrast between Britain's attitudes regarding two *Catholic* countries. Given that the majority of Irish oppression takes shape in the form of the Penal Laws and targets Catholics specifically, England's support of insurrection in another Catholic country demonstrates the hollowness of the religious discrimination practiced against Irish Catholics, particularly in light of the severity of measures undertaken to put down the Irish rebellion and continuing domestic unrest. By this three-way comparison, Moore reveals the apparent lip-service given to British proclamations of freedom and universal rights.

In the second half of the poem, Moore emphasizes the culpability of the individual to secure equal treatment for all, later drawing on the religious aspect that surfaces in the comparison of Ireland and Spain. Immediately following the previous passage, Moore states: "Oh! Trust me, Self can cloud the brightest cause, / Or guild the worst; -- and then, for nations' laws! / Go, good civilian,

shut thy useless book" (63-65). Moore again mentions the "self" or self-interested motivations of the individual in order to emphasize the ways in which various actions can be rationalized and justified by selfish motivations. Yet this mention of "self" is followed by his imperative command to "Go, good citizen," a phrase that simultaneously initiates a call to action, establishes the value or morality of the actor, and specifies the actions of the common citizen, *not* the political authorities. These powers that be are ultimately dismantled in the latter part of the line, when he tells the reader to "shut thy useless book," presumably the book of existing laws codified under Grotius's theories of international law and the philosophy of natural laws. These laws in part gain their authority through tradition and legal precedent; however, in Moore's view, these laws as they are written either condone or justify the immoral (albeit not illegal) actions of politicians and governments and are therefore useless to the average citizen. He tells his audience, "In force alone for laws of nations look," urging his readers to examine the laws currently in place and judge for themselves not only their effectiveness, but also the actual fairness or applicability of the laws to all men.

In this combination, Moore embarks on the argument that scepticism and resisting established, government sanctioned acts of oppression are matters of Christian duty. This connection builds slowly over the remainder of the poem, which he demonstrates through the role of the Sceptic. He describes the Sceptic in lines 71-74 as an independent, neutral party not bound by the allegiances or interests of a specific group, nor the artificial loyalty secured by pensions or sinecures. The Sceptic is also immune to "dreams of future time / Those shadowy forms of sleek reversions rise, / So dear to Scotchmen's second-sighted eyes" (76-78). These criteria define the "good citizen" of the previous verse, one who can sincerely be described as avoiding such matters of personal interest as political biases and financial gain. Yet this description is also couched in

terms with religious nuances, such as line 71, where he declares that the Sceptic "burns on neither shrine the balm of praise!" The line draws heavily on imagery of the Catholic Mass, as Moore makes reference to burning and a "balm" or holy oil that is suggestive of the chrism oils used during specific rites and sacraments. In contrast to the neutral Sceptic, the image equates steadfast adherence to party politics to a type of praise or worship and ultimately conjures the association of paganism and a religion in which Christian values are replaced by political party policy. The Sceptic, in contrast, is independent of the kind of ideology that replaces religious belief with political bias, and therefore ideally remains true to Christian virtue.

Moore's reference to "second-sight" also continues this negative assessment of politics as well as his use of the sight motif to uncover governmental injustice. Unlike previous references to sight that alluded to being clear minded or having understanding, in these lines, the metaphor takes on decidedly negative connotations since the "second-sight" referenced is tied to more financial gain, as described by the "reversions" of line 77. This negative meaning is emphasized by the connection between clairvoyance and the supernatural and is reminiscent of superstitious practices, which stands in contrast to the figure of rational Christianity presented by the Sceptic. Given the common association between second sight and pending disaster, the reference serves as a subtle echo of Moore's ending warning in *Corruption*, where he advises key political figures that self-interest will eventually lead to ruin. The association of "second-sight" with the Scottish people, furthermore, creates an additional sense of foreboding by recalling the multiple conflicts arising between England and Scotland after the Acts of Union of 1707, an agreement to which Scotland assented based on the hope of financial gain. The audience's knowledge of these incidents, combined with the Sceptic's neutral and questioning nature, enables the reader to envisage a future that contains more conflict between England and Ireland, yet this instance of prediction acts

more as a form of reasonable conclusion based on proof of examples rather than supernatural prophecy.

The Sceptic's neutrality and reason becomes crucial in the next lines when Moore uses imagery of the Crucifixion of Christ to criticize both Whig and Tory parties. According to Moore, party alliances leave "Freedom's form […] crucified between" (82), while the Whig and Tory parties are described as "thief opposed to thief" (80), metaphors that clearly recall Christian imagery of the Crucifixion in order to damn the discriminatory policies of the Tories along with what Moore sees as the halfhearted efforts of the Whigs to secure Catholic Emancipation. He bookends this image with the question, "Yet who […] /But flies from *both* to honesty and thee?" (79, 84). In this final line of the stanza, Moore once again emphasizes a neutral position as the Sceptic rejects both Whig and Tory parties, yet this neutrality positions the Sceptic *between* the parties, in the same place as Freedom in the metaphor, and by virtue of the comparison, in a position that is Christ-like, emphasizing the overall virtue of the Sceptic as opposed to the steadfastly ideological. Throughout the remainder of the poem, Moore emphasizes the Sceptic's questioning nature by offering the "shades of tranquil learning" (88) as an alternative. This learning, however, requires the Sceptic to remain vigilant, as Moore demonstrates the ways in which history is rewritten by politics (90-104), science and philosophy are subject to change according to new theories and discoveries (105-116), and theology is subject to interpretation (129-134). He states that "Unletter'd minds have taught and charm'd us most" (124), demonstrating the dangers of intellectual apathy. Such mental passivity leaves the individual vulnerable to the "charms" of charismatic, but ultimately unknowledgeable instructors and the potentially dangerous theories they espouse.

This line of argument would seem to be a complete change in topic, yet the final stanza of the satire draws the concepts of knowledge and Christianity together to emphasize the overall

Christian duty of the Sceptic. He opens by praising "modest ignorance" (135) and the "humbly wise" (136), along with the Sceptic (137). This tribute counters the pseudo-religious praise given to party politics in line 71 by offering a "tranquil port" (138) rather than the image of violent crucifixion that followed the previous reference to worship. Yet the wording of these designations is significant in that he pairs each category of learning or intelligence with a specific merit, both of which imply the individual's knowledge and acceptance of personal limitations. Likewise, the Sceptic here is surrounded by classical Christian values as Moore lists Charity, Virtue, Faith, Patience, and Hope before ending the satire with the lines, "These are the mild, the blest associates given / to him who doubts, and trusts in nought but Heaven!" (151-152). The overall tone of the passage is one in which the formation of belief is encouraged through intellectual pursuit, while the doubting nature of the Sceptic helps curb the individual's tendency toward fanaticism and personal interest critiqued in earlier stanzas. Furthermore, in the final line, Moore clearly ranks scepticism among the Seven Heavenly Virtues of the Catholic Catechism, by naming them as "associates" of the Sceptic. The stress on knowledge and wisdom in the latter half of the poem combined with this emphasis on virtue suggests that the Sceptic is an idealized and personified figure of the cardinal virtue of Prudence, the exercise of discernment and good judgement that dictates the successful use of all other virtues.

The overall gist of this closing is that scepticism, or Prudence, is a passive virtue, albeit from Moore's perspective, the foundation on which later political motivation is or should be founded. The first step in combatting oppression and securing freedom for all citizens is for the audience to uncover their own culpability or unacknowledged assent to the current regime of oppression, which is done through the Sceptic's natural doubt and willingness to question. This passivity is also present in each of the virtues listed in the final stanza as well as the "tranquil port" in which the

Sceptic resides. Each of the virtues is also accompanied by a verb that indicates this inactivity, although this is by no means equal to the apathy Moore criticized in previous stanzas, since each of these virtue-verb pairings contains the potential for action: Charity "knows" and "sits" (143), but also "glows" (143), serving as a signal for others, while Faith "retires" (145) although significantly, Moore adds "till call'd" (146) and Patience "lingers" (147) and "waits" (148). Finally, and most significantly, Hope "directs" the Sceptic's gaze toward "some blue spot, just breaking in the sky!" (150), indicating that the moment for action is imminent and the wait will be ending soon. The virtue of Hope itself carries the potential for positive change, but the combination of directing and a dawn-like illusion signifies the Sceptics involvement in bringing about such positive action. Additionally, the phrase "till call'd" and the verb "direct" imply that such action is undertaken on command, giving these future actions a feeling of obligation and responsibility. Thus, Moore's final image is one in which the individual is charged with the Christian duty to first *think*, and then *act*, in ways that will dismantle the oppressive government that rules Britain, and in particular that targets Ireland and the Catholic portion of the population.

Overall, the Sceptic integrates several lines of argument used throughout Moore's three satires to reveal the duplicitous and imbalanced relationship of the British government toward the Irish and Catholic populations. Ironically, he does so by focusing on the faulty relationship between religion and power and by only mentioning religion in more generalized, non-denominational terms. As he had done in *Intolerance*, Moore raises the specter of Catholicism for his audience in key figures such as the Mass and the Crucifixion, yet these images are filtered through the lens of political argument. In the first, the "balm of praise," the Mass is distorted into pagan ritual, an image that draws on the Protestant reader's mistrust of Catholic custom in order to demonstrate the perversion inherent in political biases. In the second image, that of "Freedom's form," Moore

replaces the figure of Christ with Freedom, who is murdered by the faulty dealings of both Whig and Tory parties. Unlike the previous poems in which the theme of concealing/revealing is done in more figurative terms, in *The Sceptic*, Moore's "revealing" is concerned more with uncovering the reader's self-deception. Moore's heavy-handed use of religious iconography builds a sense of (Catholic?) guilt in his reader by using the Sceptic to uncover various levels of self-deception and political hypocrisy, ultimately demonstrating the ways in which general apathy contributes to widespread oppression. Yet this personification of Freedom becomes synonymous with the Sceptic, the ideal character to which the reader is supposed to aspire. This combination of Christ-like virtue and philosophical ideal ultimately calls the reader to step into the role of the hero to combat British oppression. Such a call to action is made possible through the absence of the author within the text, since Moore's anonymous authorship enables him to fade into the masses with his reader.

The Sceptic marks the last of Moore's early Juvenalian satires and provides a key transition point into his more congenial Horatian satires. Over the course of the three satires, the tone progresses from strict Juvenalian harangue in *Corruption*, to more targeted criticism of the government in *Intolerance*, and finally to a less critical tone meant to inspire readers of both faiths and political parties to self-reflection and action in *The Sceptic*. Across the three poems, Moore accomplishes this while also drawing the wrongdoings of prominent political figures into public vision, even though he himself remains invisible behind the screen of anonymity, choosing instead to filter his own presence through the more universal identity of Irishness as a means of protecting himself against the dangers of being charged with sedition for his outspokenness. This universality and anonymity, on the one hand, speaks to the duty of every individual to combat oppression, both by encouraging the Irish to stand up for fair treatment as well as by giving English readers a universal figure with which they can empathize. On the other hand, the lack of individual identity

works against Moore's goal by creating distance between himself and his reader in giving them an impersonal narrator, making this process of empathy more difficult. This impersonal narrator also undermines the sense of "duty" indicated at the end of the poem and signals the need for a more directly involved poet activist, which he finds in *Intercepted Letters*. In this later satire, Moore is able to adopt a more involved persona thanks to the mitigating tone of the Horatian satire, which lessens and deflects the severity of the criticism offered even though the danger of seditious charges remains, and is, in fact, heightened in the public squib warfare immediately preceding the poem's publication.

Intercepted Letters

After the publication of *The Sceptic*, Moore's satiric bite stands silent, much like the virtue Patience, "mutely waiting" (148) at the end of the poem. Yet, instead of waiting "till the storm be o'er" (148), Moore's satiric anger steps in at a moment in which the danger is highest. Beginning in February 1812, Moore (and others, such as Leigh Hunt and Lord Byron) began to engage in an ongoing battle of public, satiric warfare in the *Morning Chronicle* against the Prince Regent and his supporters. Moore's contributions, written in a rollicking anapestic measure, began with a piece later titled, "Parody of a Celebrated Letter", that bitterly mocked the Prince Regent for his abandonment of the Whig party and the cause of Catholic Emancipation (J. Moore xxi). This "squib-warfare", as it came to be called, cemented Moore's skill as a master of the occasional or topical satire, a type of guerilla poetry, or as Kyle Grimes calls it, "hacker satire", which is "parasitic, derivative, opportunistic, or parodic" and which "exploits both the tactical ingenuity of the satirist/publisher and the technologies of print and distribution that can respond quickly and massively to momentary and fleeting opportunities in the public sphere" (174). Moore not only

draws the material for his satires from the periodicals, but also utilizes those same periodicals as a means of distributing satires that are cuttingly relevant and timely, while appealing to a broad audience that is already familiar with the events being mocked. By availing himself of the mass public appeal of the periodicals, Moore is able to develop a satiric style that is as "in the moment" as the events he satirizes.

The danger of such "warfare," however, is in the potential for and ramifications of discovery, as this "squib warfare" eventually culminated in the arrest and conviction of Leigh Hunt and his brother, John, on charges of seditious libel for remarks made against the Regent. Moore escapes this detection in large part due to the pattern of anonymity and verbal peek-a-boo first initiated in his Juvenalian satires. Unlike *Corruption and Intolerance* where the epistolary format is a mere by-product of a particular satiric form, in *Intercepted Letters or, The Two-Penny Post-Bag* (1813), imagined letter-writing becomes the primary vehicle for satiric wit, although there are multiple layers of satire within the text. As Moore's first book-length satire, *Intercepted Letters* criticizes the Regent on both personal and political grounds at a moment in which satiric anger was most dangerous, and it is the combination of pseudonymous authorship and epistolary format that enables Moore to dart in and out of his own text at will, sometimes in the persona of the supposed editor, Thomas Brown, sometimes (albeit rarely and with a sense of deniability) as himself, and at other moments in the persona of the various characters used as the voice of individual letters.

Such satire is dependent upon ephemera (such as the periodicals) and finds the "letter", both as a source of content and as a format, particularly appropriate, yet in *Intercepted Letters*, Moore transitions this ephemera, with its mix of trivial, frivolous content and serious political rhetoric, into the more permanent literature of the book. This permanence therefore creates a lasting, and publicly visible, record of the government's misdeeds, both personal and political, as

opposed to the somewhat easily forgotten impermanence of ephemera. With this in mind, the satire is composed of a series of "letters" that are presented within a paratextual frame story that in itself is a satiric stab at the Society for the Suppression of Vice. As explained in the Preface, "The Bag, from which the following Letters are selected, was dropped by a Twopenny Postman about two months since, and picked up by an emissary of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, who, supposing it might materially assist the private researches of that Institution, immediately took it to his employers and was rewarded handsomely for his trouble" (80). However, upon discovering the letters had been written by various high ranking members of the government and social elite, including the Prince Regent, they were scrapped as a means of gathering information and sold to the author. The "author" of the volume is Tom Brown, an ambitious young writer who seems oblivious to the political import of the letters. Both the pseudonym, Tom Brown, and the frame story are paratextual satire for the reader. The persona, as Jane Moody explains in "Thomas Brown [alias Thomas Moore]: Censorship and Regency Cryptography", references the notorious Restoration satirist Thomas Brown, who developed the technique of using the asterisk or dash to partially obscure the names of his targets, a tool that had become common satiric practice by the early nineteenth century and was adopted by Moore throughout his satires to great effect. The technique "[turns] readers into cryptographers" (Moody 190), making the readership complicit in the satiric act by forcing the reader to subconsciously fill in the blanks and identify the satire's targets. Although the name and character of the imagined author is readily identifiable as Moore, this pseudonymous authorship again allows him to circumvent the same anti-sedition laws he mocks by creating distance between himself and the content of the work and enabling a type of deniability. His targets, on the other hand, are unable to claim such deniability as the satire reveals

not only the secretive actions of a government sanctioned agency, but also the imagined private correspondence of a social group normally held above reproach.

The frame story, meanwhile, incorporates two related literary tropes in order to capitalize on the satiric paratext, such as the older epistolary format and the found letter trope, which had already been used in other satires between 1807 and 1821 (Dyer 154). These works, however, lacked the development of a frame story to explain the letters' acquisition (Dyer 155), a frame story that Moore takes great pains to develop. By explaining the letter's provenance as a result of the activities of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, Moore draws attention to the government practice of using informers and intercepting foreign and domestic mail as a means of rooting out sedition and libel. The unlikelihood of encountering royal correspondence in the post heightens the comedy of the piece while exposing the hypocrisy of the Society's actions. In addition, as Dyer points out, the frame story creates a situation in which the reader is given a voyeuristic view of the government and royal family's personal and political correspondence by hypothetically subjecting the government to its own surveillance techniques.

The content of the satire is split between several current controversies and disputes in addition to the concerns over government surveillance of private correspondence, however the majority of the work deals with various aspects of the Catholic (and by implication, the Irish) struggle for Emancipation under British law. These aspects include the controversial issue of Royal veto to the appointment of Catholic bishops, the Hunt brothers' trial for libel in 1813, and the Regent's political abandonment of the Whigs and Whig principles such as Catholic Emancipation. The first, third, and fourth letters in particular deal with these issues by satirizing the Regent and his administration. The first letter, a note from Princess Charlotte, the Prince Regent's daughter, to

Lady Barbara Ashley, highlights a more generalized anti-Catholic discrimination as well as government paranoia by use of comic exaggeration. The letter begins:

> My dear Lady Bab, you'll be shock'd, I'm afraid,
>
> When you hear the sad rumpus your Ponies have made;
>
> Since the time of horse-consuls (now long out of date)
>
> No nags ever made such a stir in the State! (1-4).

The "stir" she describes is the outrage of her father's ministers and their interpretation of the gift as a sinister attempt to undermine the English government and restore Catholics to political power. Moore's characterization of Princess Charlotte, according to Jane Moore, draws on frequent depictions of the Princess as supportive of the Whigs and Catholic emancipation (447.14n) [57], a portrayal that "exploits her political innocence to suggest the absurdity of the anti-Catholic reaction" (J. Moore 77). By opening the work in the borrowed persona of the Princess, Moore relies upon her personal ethos and the general public's good will toward the Princess to establish sympathy for the Catholic cause among his English readership. However, this persona also capitalizes upon her youth and femininity in order to appeal to his Irish readership by recalling the *aisling* and Mother Ireland motifs, although the technique here is more subtle than in *Irish Melodies* or *Corruption*, where the gendered references to Ireland become prominent thematic features. As the Regent and his advisors represent, literally and figuratively, the dominance of the English government, Princess Charlotte, through her support for the Whig party and Catholic emancipation,

[57] These depictions include Byron's "Sympathetic Address to a Lady Weeping", published March 7, 1812 in the *Morning Chronicle*. Byron's poem recounts an incident in which the Princess "had supposedly burst into tears over the treachery of her father at a Carlton House banquet on 22 February where the Regent petulantly abused his quondam Whig allies" (Vail 52).

becomes a symbol for Ireland, subject to the patriarchical influence of her father and the English government.

Among these advisors, Moore names prominent anti-Catholic or anti-Irish figures such as John Scott, Lord Eldon; Home Secretary, Henry Addington, Lord Sidmouth; and Nicholas Vansittart, then the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Concerns over the "Catholic threat," as represented by the ponies, escalates when Eldon declares that:

> T'is a scheme of the Romanists, so help me God!
> To ride over your most Royal Highness roughshod –
> […]
> Bad enough 'twas for Troy to be sack'd by a *Horse*,
> But for us to be ruin'd by *Ponies* still worse!" (19-23)

Likewise, Addington (nicknamed The Doctor) and Vansittart add that:

> …these skittish young a-bominations
> Are clearly foretold in Chap. Vi. Revelations (32-33).

In these sections, the simple gift of a pair of ponies is elevated to the status of both epic and apocalyptic catastrophe, demonstrating the absurdity of anti-Catholic paranoia and the political extremes of the politicians Moore satirizes. Moore saves the most powerful hit, however, for Lord Castlereagh, who first proposes flogging the ponies "within half an inch of their lives" (45) as a means of taming the feared beasts. The brutality of the proposed solution recalls Castlereagh's role in punishing insurrectionists after the Irish Uprising of 1798, when rebels were fastened to triangle-shaped frames in order to be flogged, a method that earned Castlereagh the nickname, "Derry Down Triangle" (J. Moore 48.21n). Castlereagh then offers an alternative method with the conditional statement, "If this [flogging] be thought cruel" (48), a line that further emphasizes the

cruelty of his treatment of the Irish during the rebellion by drawing attention to the questionability of his actions. If the punishment could be construed as too "cruel" for ponies, then Castlereagh's actions in flogging the Irish rebels resulted in prisoners being treated worse than animals, a comparison that likewise draws attention to the mistreatment of Irish Catholics overall. In this instance, while Moore hides behind the persona of the Princess, Castlereagh and his supporters are stripped of any such shelter and their deeds exposed to public censure. The Princess acts as an informer, describing to her reader not only the confidential debates of government officials, but also reminding the reader of past transgressions that may have been, if not hidden from public view, then forgotten by dint of the passage of time.

Within the debates relayed by the Princess, the government officials are engaged in their own attempts to silence criticism and conceal their own wrongdoings. The second method proposed by Lord Castlereagh for taming the "ponies" is a "Veto snaffle":

> A pretty contrivance, made out of old chains,
> Which appears to indulge, while it doubly restrains;
> Which however high-mettled, their gamesomeness checks,
> (Adds his Lordship humanely) or else breaks their necks! (50-53).

The description of the "Veto snaffle" constitutes a two-part critique of the British government by referencing both the Catholic Relief Acts and the anti-sedition measures then in place. The description here contains a more generalized reference to the struggle for Catholic Emancipation, including the more recent series of Catholic Relief Acts, which were criticized by some as mere concessions and "a means of forestalling broader parliamentary reform" (Tomko 19). The statement that the snaffle would "indulge" while it "restrains" refers to the continued exclusion of Catholics from full social and political participation in spite of the easement of the Catholic penal codes. The

Veto, however, specifically denotes the debate surrounding a measure designed to allow the Crown the final approval over the appointment of Catholic bishops in Ireland. The measure, first proposed in 1808 as a way to allay fears of foreign influence in Ireland, had initially garnered Moore's support in *A Letter to the Roman Catholics of Dublin* (1810) as a necessary concession toward gaining full Catholic Emancipation under the Tory government. But now, after the Regent's abandonment of Whig principles and the cause of Emancipation, Moore viewed the measure as a particularly damaging restriction (J. Moore, 77, 448.23n, Kelly 85-86).

Additionally, the "snaffle" effectively references the current government's enforcement of the anti-sedition and anti-libel laws by prosecuting radical publications, their authors, and their editors, such as the Hunt brothers who are mentioned in Letter III. The bit not only restrains, but its placement over the tongue also signifies the ways in which the anti-sedition and anti-libel laws silence and control the Catholic and Irish populations. Moore repeats this imagery of silencing in Letter IV in Castlereagh's drunken ramblings, as well as in Letter III when he references the Hunt brothers' trial for libel. In Letter IV, the speaker, Patrick Duigenan recounts a conversation with Castlereagh in which the Irish are "Papist dogs" (6) to be "humbug[ged] with kind professions" (11), another reference to the ways in which the Catholic Relief Acts were regarded as mere lip-service to the cause of Emancipation. Interestingly enough, Castlereagh states that Duigenan also must be "muzzled" (14, 16) in his outspokenness against Catholic relief. Duigenan, although a Tory and staunch opponent of Catholic emancipation, was the son of Irish Catholic parents. Moore's portrayal of Duigenan as "muzzled" effectively relegates him to the same category as the Irish he combats, demonstrating the ways in which his Irish nationality transcends political and religious affiliation to subject him to the same social attitudes and discrimination.

Letter III purports to be a letter written from the Prince Regent to the Earl of Yarmouth, describing a dinner hosted in celebration of the Hunt brothers' conviction for libel against the Regent. The letter starts off describing the dishes and delicacies provided at the dinner in order to satirize the Regent's spendthrift lifestyle. As J. Moore notes in her Introduction to the satires, "Food…is a familiar metaphor for excessive consumption, and has an overtly political significance in Letter III" (xxiii), since "excessive consumption" was a popular critique of the Regent, exemplified in his physical characteristics (obesity), his excessive debts, and his obsession with luxurious and foreign commodities. The trial itself, however, is only mentioned in stanza two before Moore returns to satirizing various personages via food imagery and analogy. As the Regent describes:

> The dinner, you know, was in gay celebration
>
> Of *my* brilliant triumph and H—nt's condemnation;
>
> […]
>
> And we car'd not for Juries or Libels—no—damme! Nor
>
> Ev'n for the threats of last Sunday's Examiner! (15-16, 23-24).

The brevity of the discussion demonstrates the ways in which such libels are now expected to fade from public consciousness the same way they fade from the concern of the drunken dinner guests, since, as Moody asserts, the trial "is invoked directly only to be suppressed" (191), a rhetorical move in which Moore mimicks the censorship enacted by such anti-sedition and anti-libel statutes. On the surface, criticism of these statutes seems to be the primary purpose of the satiric references, yet Moore relies on the reader's familiarity with the context of the dispute in order to also criticize the Regent's failure to follow through on his promises for Catholic Emancipation. Such references to Hunt's libelous articles also creates a vague reference to the more recent squib battles of the *Morning Chronicle*, once again drawing Moore surreptitiously and indirectly into his

own text. This association relies solely on the reader's ability to make the connection, as a more direct self-reference would put Moore in danger by linking him directly with the seditious squibs. In this case, however, Moore is able to hide behind this indirection as well as the letter's fictitious "author," in this case, the Regent himself.

This reference to the Hunt trial, however, is worth examining in more detail as it demonstrates essential differences between Moore's satiric approach to criticism versus Leigh Hunt's more direct and libelous methodology. On March 17, 1812, the Marquis of Lansdowne presided over the annual dinner in celebration of St. Patrick's Day, with prominent Irish Catholic supporters such as the Marquis of Downshire, the Earl of Moira (Moore's patron), Richard Brinsley Sheridan, and the Lord Mayor in attendance (Thomas 146). As Donald Thomas records in *Bibliographical Notes*, "When Lansdowne gave 'the Health of the King,' it was drunk with 'enthusiastic applauses,' But the toast of 'the Health of the Prince Regent' provoked only 'loud and reiterated hisses" (147) and Sheridan's subsequent attempts to defend the Regent were further shouted down. The *Morning Post*, published March 19, recounted the incident in an effort to follow Sheridan's example of defending the Regent, but instead provoked a vehement response from the Hunt brothers in their March 22 issue of the *Examiner*. The article, titled "The Prince Regent on St. Patrick's Day," lambasts the *Morning Post* for their "disgusting flatteries" (179) and hypocrisy, all the while calling attention to the Regent's personal, professional, and political failings. In one particularly damning paragraph, Hunt describes the Regent as:

> A violator of his word, a libertine over head and ears in debt and disgrace, a despiser of domestic ties, the companion of gamblers and demireps, a man who has just closed a half a century without one single claim on the gratitude of his country or the respect of posterity! (179).

In addition to these libelous attacks, Hunt's rhetoric in particular focuses on various instances of silencing and confinement, a theme that Moore mirrors in *Intercepted Letters*. Yet the differences between Hunt and Moore's use of this motif is also indicative of their separate nationalities. When Hunt recounts Lord Moira's speech, he deliberately calls attention to Moira's "silence" on the Regent ("not a word was uttered of the Regent" and "not a word – not a syllable!" (178). Additionally, after Sheridan's attempt to defend the Regent, Hunt notes the "dead silence" from Moira, the Marquis of Lansdowne and the Duke of Devonshire (179) instead of joining Sheridan's praises. Hunt's rhetoric draws attention to what is lacking more so than what is said – for Hunt, their lack of praise is indicative of ill-regard for the Regent. Moore, however, uses the motif of silence as a means of demonstrating self-preservation as well as illustrating the government's oppression, as in the symbolism of the snaffle and muzzle in addition to the silencing of the press by means of the Hunt brothers' prosecution and conviction. The Hunt brothers write from the position of English citizens, and although they are supporters of Catholic Emancipation and Whig politics, they are not subject to the same laws they critique. Moore, on the other hand, speaks from the position of an Irish Catholic who is subject to the very measures he opposes, and who likewise risks prosecution. Moore's emphasis on their trial, additionally serves to underscore their position of privilege as English citizens who are given the full benefit of the English judicial system (regardless of its problems), in contrast to such libel trials as the prosecution of Irish journalist Peter Finnerty, who was convicted of libel on Castlereagh in February 1811 for exposing the cruelties committed against Irish prisoners during the uprising of 1798 (Moody 189). During the trial, the prosecution

attempted to prevent Finnerty from introducing evidence in his favor, namely documents verifying the legitimacy of his claims against Castlereagh.[58]

Moore subtly raises the issue of the trial again by means of the manuscript of a drama mentioned in Letter VII. In this letter, the bookseller merely mentions that the work "t'wouldn't do" (2) and any indication of the actual content of the play is semi-hidden in an Appendix. In these notes, Moore primarily satirizes the Regent's treatment of his wife Caroline; however, he describes briefly the content of Act II in which two characters resembling the Hunt brothers are sentenced to prison. References to "Spring" in the main character's speech allude to the Hunt brother's publication of "The Prince Regent on St. Patrick's Day" (J. Moore 456.156n). Tom Brown's attitude toward the excerpt is dismissive, mentioning it only briefly before moving on, another instance of the trial being "invoked only to be suppressed." As Moody asserts, "The trial becomes the hole or censored narrative at the center of this rejected drama, the event or 'underplot' whose narration is carefully avoided or prohibited" (192). The rejection of the manuscript, first by the theatre and then by the bookseller, further illustrates a growing literary culture of suppression and fear of prosecution. As Dyer asserts in "Intercepted Letters, Men of Information: Moore's *Twopenny Post-Bag* and *Fudge Family in Paris*", "Satires in the Romantic period…often dramatize their own need to fend off prosecution" (157) by drawing attention to their own strategies of self-censorship, yet Dyer also asserts in *British Satire and the Politics of Style* that the boundaries of permissible criticism were a moving target in the early nineteenth century, as sedition and libel laws were often enforced inconsistently (73). To support this argument, he (and Jane Moore) offer up the prosecution and conviction of the Hunt brothers for "referring to the Prince as a 'corpulent man of fifty'" (73, J.

[58] At the time, however, based on existing common law, the basis for libel was determined by the effect of the text, namely in its ability to antagonize the target. Truth would not be considered a valid defense against libel until 1843. (Dyer, *British Satire*, 71).

Moore 70), while Moore escaped punishment for his satires, as well as a later cut at the Regent included in *Irish Melodies* (J. Moore xxiv).[59] However, three factors weaken the comparison between Hunt and Moore. The first factor is the overly-reductive summation of Hunt's criticism of the Regent as "a corpulent man of fifty," when in fact, as the paragraph excerpted above demonstrates, Hunt's argument accused the Regent of more severe moral failings such as lying, committing adultery, and keeping company with persons of questionable reputation. The second factor that undermines this comparison is the respective genres in which the Hunts and Moore were writing. The Hunt brothers' criticism of the Regent appeared as a prose editorial article in a periodical publication to which their names were affixed. In this mode, attacks on the Regent are delivered directly without offering the reader the pretense of literary enjoyment. Moore's work, on the other hand, is clearly satirical in practice and "it was notoriously difficult to base a prosecution on the codified literary form of satire, as proved by the failed trial of William Hone in 1817" (J. Moore xxiv).

As with the majority of the rest of the satire, references to the Hunt brothers are couched in the persona of one of Moore's letter writers, in this case the Regent himself. However, references to the Hunt trial, an actual, recent event, as opposed to the imaginary dispute over the ponies, allows Moore to enter his own text secretly, yet within the protection of deniability. As one of the participants in similar print warfare against the Regent, Moore's own actions and involvement are echoed in the text, as his criticism of the Regent echoes his real-life support of the Hunt brothers.

[59] The poem in question is Moore's "When I first Met Thee" (1815), which is commonly assumed to be a stab at the Regent for his treatment of Maria Fitzherbert, the Regent's Catholic mistress who he secretly (and illegally) wed in December 1785 and later abandoned (J. Moore xxiv). The poem, while suggestive, never mentions the Regent overtly and would have allowed Moore to deny any similarities as mere coincidence – and possibly the result of the Regent's guilty conscience.

Conclusion

In her biography of Moore, Linda Kelly begins her chapter on the Irish Uprising with the words of the ballad, "Who fears to speak of Ninety-Eight?" (24), lyrics that both challenge the listener to remain silent and indicate the personal dangers involved in speaking of such an event. In the wake of the Uprising, when English anxieties of open rebellion combined with anti-Catholic sentiment, any outspoken support of a free Ireland was sure to draw dangerous attention and risk the speaker's freedom and safety. Thus the critical moments of Thomas Moore's coming of age were marked by an atmosphere of oppression, anxiety, violence, and fear of retribution, an environment of repression that continued well into Moore's adulthood. Despite these dangers, Moore attempted to support resistance to English discriminatory practices, yet the evident trauma of the Uprising prompted him toward more non-violent means of protest. This commitment to non-violence results in Moore's satires, which are marked by his experiences with both patriotic fervor and a sense of defiance. Yet the risk of publishing necessitated anonymity and throughout the development of the satires, from his earliest letters in *The Press* to his independent verse satires such as *Intercepted Letters*, he maintains a pattern of anonymous or pseudonymous publication in order to shield himself from charges of political dissent and seditious libel against the Regent and other prominent political figures. This pattern in tandem with the character of the satires, as the various iterations of anonymous authorship combine with a satirical tone that steadily slides from the bitter Juvenalian invective fitting of the United Irishmen to a Horatian voice better suited to his non-violent approach. This development of tone mirrors Moore's commitment to non-violent protest in the wake of the Uprising, but also creates a form of satire that functions as poetic activism, particularly as *The Sceptic* ends with the proposition that combatting oppression is a matter of Christian duty.

This anonymous authorship is both vital to ensuring Moore's personal safety by removing the risk of identification, as well as detrimental to the literary success of the pieces, as the wholly anonymous works failed to garner much attention from Moore's audience (or from scholars in the present day). Unlike Burns and Byron who published their works under the stamp of their own name, for Thomas Moore's satires, recognition and attribution are by and large actual threats to safety and security due to the risk of prosecution for sedition and treason. Moore relies on a persona that functions in the invisible spaces of either collective identity (e.g. the Irishman of *Corruption and Intolerance* and *The Sceptic*) or in the shapeshifting guise of multi-voiced works such as *Intercepted Letters*. In the former, this collective identity serves to protect his privacy, livelihood, and reputation by creating an authorial figure who is recognized only by nationality and who ideally stands for the whole of the Irish nation. Yet this unnamed "Irishman" also robs the works of a greater audience and effectiveness by means of its vagueness, while the tone of *Corruption* in particular creates an "us and them" type of divide that pits Irish against English. Changes in tone across *Intolerance* and *The Sceptic* serve to correct this divide, as Moore refines his satiric attacks to target and expose the political leaders responsible for oppressing the Irish. This figure becomes a stand-in for the common, everyday man since *The Sceptic* ends with the implication that combatting oppression is a matter of Christian duty, a principle that applies to his broader audience, both Catholic and Protestant, Irish and English. The appeal to religious feeling erases the former boundaries between political parties, denomination, and national identity in an attempt to unify the audience and spur them to action in favor of the Irish and Catholic Emancipation.

In the latter satire, *Intercepted Letters*, Moore's shapeshifting speaker shields him from the direct view of his audience as well as his targets, and Moore's true persona surfaces only periodically by means of references to other works or contextual events. The first of these

appearances occurs in the pseudonym itself, as Moore writes from behind the appellation of "Thomas Brown," a notorious Restoration satirist. Moore relies on the audience's recognition of the name "Thomas Brown" as a pre-existing author, a name any satirist familiar with the English tradition could adopt as a pseudonym. This name also, however, conveniently follows Moore's previous use of a pseudonym with the same first name of Thomas, as he had done with the fictitious *Poetic Works of the Late Thomas Little, Esq.* (1801). Unlike the Juvenalian poems, whose authorship stood totally anonymous and independent of any of his other works, the name itself is meant to recall Moore's other poetic endeavors and leaves the entire poem with a shadowy sense of Moore's presence. Within the poem, Moore uses contextual details, such as the trial of Leigh Hunt, to recall his work writing squibs in the *Morning Chronicle*; however, in this letter he does so from the persona of the Prince Regent. By using the Regent as his new mouthpiece, Moore demonstrates that his targets can be transformed into messengers for his anti-oppression crusade, since these figures can unwittingly be used to incriminate and criticize themselves.

As Jane Moody declares of Moore's contributions to the *Morning Chronicle*:

> The squib is a poem turned weapon: the anonymous shot, fired from who knows where. For Moore, the power of the squib arises from its equivocal position between the written and spoken word, between private and public lives. Many of these weapons exploit the rhetorical effects of allowing private communications to leach into public discourse: conversations overheard; diaries violated; letters wrenched from their addressees. (189).

While Moody's assessment seems apt, I would shift this statement slightly to argue that Moore and his narrator, more so than the poem, become the weapon by dint of his access to the source of his information and his ability to blend in with those he satirizes. Moore, and by extension his narrator,

then becomes a dangerous figure, a spy capable of taking any form or persona, even that of his enemies, flitting in and out of the shadows of his satire at will. Just as he emphasized honorable conduct during his time at Trinity College both preceding and during the United Irishmen Uprising, Moore's conduct and position as a favored author grant him access to those upper echelons of society where his narrator lurks. Moore conforms to the patterns of behavior that enable him to hide in plain sight, to blend in socially and culturally with those he targets, as many of the anecdotes he relies on for his satire are the fruit of his social activities. By upholding and conforming to these standards of behavior, Moore simultaneously demonstrates the cultural and social equality of the Irish to the English, while also managing to turn that equality into a weapon by using that access to dismantle his opposition. *Intercepted Letters* finalizes a pattern of non-violent resistance begun in the wake of the Irish rebellion and serves as a rejection of the violence that marked the latter days of the United Irishmen and the more savage stereotypes attributed to the Irish by the English.

Chapter 3

"Of Wrath and Rhyme": Byron's English Bards and Scotch Reviewers *and the Struggle for National Identity*

In 1809, a young aristocrat published a satire he would eventually grow to regret. Only seven years after the publication of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* (EBSR), Lord Byron would scribble comments in a copy belonging to his friend, Charles Dallas, ridiculing the poem that had cemented his success as a poet as a "miserable record of misplaced anger and indiscriminate acrimony." In an early draft of the work, Byron had intended only a light-hearted Horatian critique of the current style of poetry, but after a scathing review of his juvenile collection, *Hours of Idleness* (1807), Byron revised the piece into a Juvenalian harangue blasting not only modern and seemingly inferior schools of poetry, but also the literary reviewers who proposed to shape the taste of such up and coming styles. On the surface, the poem purports to be a defense of Augustan and classical verse, a favoritism held out by the satire's indebtedness to models such as Pope's *Dunciad* and William Gifford's *Baeviad* and *Maeviad*. However, as the title, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, suggests, within the text Byron also draws a clear distinction based on national divides, a division prompted by the nature of Brougham's attacks on Byron's imperfect expression of Scottish heritage within *Hours of Idleness*. The title's structure creates an "us and them" mentality between the *English* poets – Pope, Gifford, Dryden (and Byron, their acolyte) – and Scottish reviewers, such as Francis Jeffrey and Henry Brougham, and the new poets they represent, figureheads of the northern literary landscape.

This "us and them" divide is further cemented in the nature of the arguments presented against the poets as Byron's remarks exploit national origins to wield accusations of immorality,

literary profiteering, and lack of poetic ability. He follows a similar pattern of verbal abuse against the reviewers; however, since his criticisms are directed at Jeffrey and Brougham, two key writers for the *Edinburgh Review*, Byron frames his insults more closely on both the manner of criticisms leveled at *Hours of Idleness* and the literary techniques used in that volume, as well as on the stereotypes associated with the Scottish Highland/Lowland divide. This chapter will analyze the relationship between *Hours of Idleness* and *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* to demonstrate the influence *Hours of Idleness* and Brougham's resultant critique had in reshaping Byron's attitudes toward national identity in *EBSR*. In this chapter, an analysis of *Hours of Idleness* reveals two distinct attributes: the theme of Byron's own struggles with national identification and a pattern of feminine imagery used to imagine Scotland. In the first, Byron's insecurities regarding national identity are reshaped after Brougham's review according to outward perceptions of Englishness, an Englishness that is, for Byron, expressed through attitudes and behaviors associated with the gentlemanly conduct expected of a man of his social rank. Secondly, the pattern of feminine imagery is carried from *Hours of Idleness* into the text of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, but shifts in tone from positive associations with feelings of national belonging in *Hours of Idleness*, to negative associations with a lack of masculine ability in *EBSR*. In *EBSR*, Byron uses this emphasis on masculine conduct versus (now) negative feminine imagery, to frame a paradigm of Scottish masculinity that is influenced by social and cultural expectations to brand Scottish identity as inferior and undesirable. He then reshapes his own sense of national identity according to the standards of aristocratic masculinity. Together, these thematic and rhetorical features are directed at Jeffrey and Brougham in a way that portrays their failure to uphold literary standards as a failure to uphold masculine, particularly gentlemanly, behaviors and attitudes in print. I will argue that in this development of imagery, Byron suggests that an author's nationality is both dependent upon

and influenced by behavior and actions as they demonstrate (or fail to demonstrate) acceptable standards of gentlemanly, masculine conduct, and ultimately implies that the example of English masculinity associated with Byron's aristocratic rank is superior to the behaviors and attitudes expressed by non-English authors and critics.

National identity as a construct of behavior also plays out to a degree in the works of Robert Burns and Thomas Moore. For Burns, satire is an attempt to critique and correct the negative behaviors that give rise to the stereotypical allegations of superstition, immorality, and cultural backwardness that are typically applied to the Scottish by the English. While the attitudes and behaviors Burns critiques are by no means limited to the Highlanders, these stereotypes are in large part a result of longstanding political tension between England and the Highland region of Scotland, as well as socio-cultural differences between Highland and Lowland Scots based on linguistic, religious, ethnic, and educational grounds (Colley). As a lowlander hailing from Ayershire, Burns would have recoiled from such associations and regarded those behaviors as a stumbling block toward respectability. Thus, his criticism turns inward, similar to that of Swift's *Modest Proposal*, by distributing blame between the people themselves and the government that dominates them. While Scottish Lowlanders were typically regarded as culturally and linguistically more English than Scottish, the high visibility (and undesirability) of Highland culture makes the possibility of social and political equality a goal for which to strive, rather than an established fact. In Burns's view, only after such negative stereotypes are overcome will the Scottish achieve social and cultural equality with their English counterparts. Burn's perspective, however, lacks the gendered overtones present in both Moore and Byron's satires. Moore advocates for intellectual, social, and cultural equality based on the belief that equality has already been established and is inherent within the Irish people, and need only be *recognized* by the English. His works demonstrate that the Irish were

capable of upholding higher standards of education and social behavior instead of confirming the numerous stereotypes that labelled the Irish as inferior to their English counterparts. For Moore, this approach is more culturally plausible given the long-standing nature of English occupation and the resultant absorption of English cultural markers and blending of English and Irish culture by the Irish inhabitants.

In comparison, Byron's dual heritage presents a marked contrast to these authors, in both their apparent levels of security in their own expressions of national identity as well as their approach to defining that nationality. In *Hours of Idleness*, Byron consistently acknowledges and praises his Scottish heritage, although in many instances from the same Highlander perspective that seems distasteful to Burns; however, after Henry Brougham's savage review of the collection, Byron appears to forsake his Scottishness in favor of Englishness, a move that, several years later, he would directly attribute to the review's attack. It appears that in *EBSR*, Byron internalizes many of Brougham's criticisms of his under-developed Scottish heritage and responds by reshaping his own sense of national identity via familiar means: the behavioral codes associated with his English title. In this redefinition, Byron's move from Scotland to England as a child corresponds to the inheritance of his title, a shift in national, social and (assumed, but not actual) economic status that, for Byron, comes to equate Englishness with the trappings of rank and status. This association of rank with nationality relies on an outward expression of conduct fitting a gentleman, a behavioral paradigm dependent upon constructs of civil behavior, morality, and honor, behaviors his targets are accused of failing to uphold.[60] According to the code of honor practiced among the ranks of the

[60] Most studies of 19th century masculinity focus on either dueling, the Victorian gentleman, strictly middle-class constructs of behavior, or behavior specifically associated with the military. The generalized behavioral codes described here have been extrapolated from Stephen Banks, *A Polite Exchange of Bullets*, David Kuchta, *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity*, Karen Harvey, "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800," and Robert Shoemaker, "The Taming of the Duel: Masculinity, Honor, and Ritual Violence in London, 1660-1800."

aristocracy and gentility, "Gentlemen became subject to the ideals of politeness, in which men were expected to control their emotions and be generous and complaisant towards those with whom they interacted" (Shoemaker 541), although these behavioral expectations also included such things as the practice of modesty and morality or virtue, particularly as the aristocracy were considered the "moral backbone of the nation" (Kuchta 101). However, these widely recognized manners are open to imitation, undermining the limited understanding of nationality demonstrated in *EBSR*, as Thomas Moore's perception of nationality relies on much the same strategy to prove the opposite point. Rather than behavior serving as an excluding force in determining outward national status as Byron's argument appears to do, Moore uses behavior as an inclusive or equalizing force. Although Moore was the son of a Dublin grocer rather than an aristocrat, he held himself to the same behavioral standards as a gentleman of Byron's class, one of the key reasons the two men would later develop such a strong friendship in the aftermath of Moore's dueling challenge as Byron came to recognize this equality.[61] Thus, while Byron's expression of national identity in *EBSR* raises questions about the state of British poetry and the literary market due to the blending of national influences, it is not only defensive, but also, still, unstable and undeveloped.

[61] The publication of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* is bookended by two dueling challenges issued by Thomas Moore to Francis Jeffrey, editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, and Lord Byron. Details of the first challenge are discussed in note 92 on page 217. Byron resurrected the embarrassing incident and accusations of cowardice as part of his attack on Jeffrey in *EBSR*, but did so in a way that also attacked Moore's masculinity and gentlemanly reputation. Moore then challenged Byron, who had already gone abroad and did not return until July 1811. A pending fifth edition of *EBSR* prompted Moore to write Byron again, but Moore tempered his tone in deference to the recent death of Byron's mother. In subsequent correspondence, Moore also awkwardly proposed overtures of friendship, resulting in the mixed tone that Byron refers to as Moore's "verbal acrobatics."

Byron asserted that he had never seen Moore's denial of the accusations regarding the duel with Jeffrey and a formal breakfast hosted by their mutual friend, Samuel Rogers, resolved the issue. Byron produced the original, unopened challenge in the presence of witnesses to preserve both participants' reputations, proving that Moore had protected his honor by issuing the challenge, and that Byron had not shirked the challenge. Byron later suppressed the fifth edition out of deference to Moore and several other victims of his satire with whom he had become friends.

An additional complication in Byron's expression of identity is the previously mentioned Scottish Highland/Lowland divide, also present in Burns's poetry. While Byron faced the more obvious repercussions of a longstanding English/Scottish rivalry, his sense of identity expressed in *Hours of Idleness* allies him with the Scottish Highlands and subjects him to the same criticisms that Burns attempts to combat in his poetry. In one example, Byron's mention of his Stuart ancestry and family's support of the Stewarts in the Battle of Culloden make him a prime target for criticism by reviving the recent historical and cultural memory of the Jacobite rebellions. Although the British government made strides toward easing the cultural, political, and economic tensions present after the failed Jacobite uprising of '45 (Colley 120-121), such a reminder would not sit well with the political temperature of Great Britain as a whole, particularly after the more recent Irish Uprising of 1798 and the overshadowing threat of war with France. These references in *Hours of Idleness*, if sincere expressions of national identity, would seem to draw another connection to Thomas Moore, as Byron would find himself a member of a cultural and social class considered inferior to the English, and one that harbors a recent history of violence and political and cultural oppression.

Dual National Identity (Scottish Son, English Lord)

Although the title of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* appears to draw distinct national boundaries, to say that Byron allied himself wholly with England while dismissing Scotland is an oversimplification that ignores the complexities of Byron's own heritage and how those intricacies play out in the text of the satire. The following brief biography of Byron's Scottish and English connections will help to contextualize the discussion of Byron's national identity. As the son of an English father and a Scottish mother, and who spent a good portion of his formative years in the north of Scotland, Byron's sense of national identity in the poem is both shifting and contradictory,

even at times, openly antagonistic as his writing expresses elements of competing cultural paradigms. Elements of these disparate paradigms can be found in Byron's familial inheritance, which crosses national, cultural, and socio-economic boundaries as the fortunes of his family rose and fell during his early years. It was through his father, Captain John Byron's family line that Byron eventually inherited the Barony and the estate of Newstead Abby, yet at the time of Byron's birth, his father was several steps removed from the title and the prospect of inheriting unlikely. While the Byrons could purportedly trace their legacy to contemporaries of William the Conqueror (Marchand 3), Byron's mother's family, the Gordons of Gight, also boasted a long and distinguished lineage, although much of the family's history was colored by notorious raiding and warmaking in the Highlands. Catherine Gordon, Byron's mother, counted James I of Scotland among her ancestors, while also having familial connections to several other leading northern Scottish families such as the Urquhart, Duff, Innes, and Abercromby families (Marchand 16-18). As the only surviving child of George Gordon of Gight, she inherited the title as the 13th Laird of Gight in her own right and stood as "the sole heir to a fortune worth close to £30,000 in Aberdeen bank shares, salmon-fishing rights, and lands, including a castle of her own" (Eisler 10).[62]

This noble heritage, however, presents a sharp contrast to the financial reality into which Byron was born. Captain Byron, made notorious by the seduction of his first wife, Amelia, Baroness Conyers and the former Marchioness of Carmarthen, spent his life dogged by creditors and married Catherine for her fortune after his first wife's death. A year after their marriage, the estate was mortgaged (eventually sold) and the money consumed by John Byron's creditors (Marchand 20),

[62] It is worth noting that the Gight title was one of the few that could be carried through the female line. The inheritance required that any male spouses also take the Gordon name in order to ensure continuity of the family line and Byron's father adopted the surname "Gordon" upon their marriage. Byron's wife's family title followed the same procedure, as Byron adopted the surname "Noel" in accordance with the rules of inheritance when Annabella Milbank Byron became the 11th Baroness Wentworth.

leaving Catherine with only a small annual allowance of £150 per year from the proceeds of the sale. The Byrons spent the next few years skirting poverty before they separated; Catherine relocated to Aberdeen to be near her own family, while Captain Byron attempted to escape his creditors by fleeing to France, where he died in August 1791, once again in debt. The family's financial difficulties and the eventual separation of his parents ensured that Byron's early years were shaped more directly by his mother's family and the Scottish culture they embodied than the English manners of his future inheritance. Although Byron states that his mother was "as haughty as Lucifer" of her ancestry (Marchand 34), Catherine's marriage had "reduced her from a proud Gordon heiress to an impoverished widow" (Marchand 32), leaving a shadow of poverty to clash with aristocratic attitudes. In comparison to her northern family, the Byron's were merely "poor [relations]" (Marchand 34), dependent upon Catherine's meager allowance and the generosity of friends and family, particularly as such financial aid was necessary for ensuring Byron a proper education and medical treatment for a clubbed foot.[63]

The effects of this contrast between aristocratic wealth and fallen wealth would have been compounded by the Byrons' proximity to Catherine's extended family who "[lived] in the privilege of huge ancestral houses: the Gordons of Fyvie; the Aberdeens of Haddo, cultured aristocrats painted resplendently in ceremonial kilts" (McCarthy 7). Gight Castle had, in fact, been purchased by the 3rd Earl of Aberdeen for his son, Lord Haddo (McCarthy 8). Catherine's move to Aberdeen had also put her in contact with her grandmother, Margaret Duff Gordon, and aunt, Miss

[63] Marchand and Eisler cite several instances of Catherine Byron soliciting financial aid from her own relations, as well as the sister of her late husband. Her kinsman, John Leslie, acted as a mediator to negotiate between Catherine Byron and the administrators of the Gight estate, and Eisler notes several requests for advances on the principal in order to meet her expenses, all the while warning against advancing too much capital as her husband would only waste it (12). Eisler also records at least two instances of requests to Captain Byron's sister, Frances Leigh, for financial assistance or forwarding requests for financial assistance to Byron's uncle, the 5th Baron Byron known as "The Wicked Lord" (19, 20).

Abercromby, both of whom had cooled relations with Catherine during her tempestuous marriage to Jack Byron (Eisler 23). Marchand describes Catherine's grandmother as "a pious and ignorant old woman" (18), who had been largely responsible for Catherine's upbringing, although he also notes that the young Catherine received an education that was markedly inferior to a woman of her station, leaving her "superstitious, a believer in ghosts, fortune-telling, and second sight" (18), as well as having "an astounding [level of] illiteracy" (18) that was displayed in her lack of grammar and spelling. In contrast to the refined social manners often expected of a noble-born woman, Byron's mother also reportedly exhibited behavior that was "rather plain and coarse, 'awkward in her movements, provincial in her accent and manner'" (Marchand 15). In summation, despite her aristocratic heritage, Catherine Gordon Byron embodied some of the worse qualities of the Scottish stereotype and her shortcomings likely led to Byron's later sensitivities about issues of rank, deference, and propriety that many biographers have noted.

The contrast between wealth and poverty within the same family is only one of several significant binaries present in Byron's early life, as his mother's reduced financial status also exposed him to differences in educational, social, and cultural paradigms that appear to influence his later reaction to Brougham's review. Marchand briefly asserts that his mother's financial status left a young Byron "conditioned […] to the views of the lower-middle-class Scottish world view with which he was daily associated in the streets and later at school" (34). Other than mentioning Byron's mother's support of the French Revolution, Marchand seems to neglect expanding on this point of discussion. Benita Eisler, however, considers these everyday encounters more fully, particularly as they contrast with Catherine's later efforts to ready her son to inherit the title. Byron's first two schools, for instance, were described as "populist" (22) and "democratic" (24) respectively, and although the second offered a higher standard of education, both clearly catered

to the lower-income families of Aberdeen. This second school in particular, the Aberdeen grammar school, provided the basics of education (writing classes were an additional expense) (24) that followed the standard English (and English-speaking) curriculum of the day while "'the work of the playground [was conducted] in broad Scotch'" (Eisler 25).[64] She also notes that "Byron moved easily between the two, with a social fluidity that would always be his special pride" (25). While Eisler focuses on the aspect of "social fluidity," her observations also draw attention to the perceived inferiority of Scots dialect as opposed to a more English-sounding expression. The language of education here is Latin and English, following the academic expectations of the English educational system. Such privileging of English at the cost of native Scots vernacular demonstrates the perceived inferiority of Scots language and culture, which is ultimately relegated to the "language of the playground" as opposed to serious conversation. This distinction ultimately helps set the stage for Byron's later internalization of Brougham's critique as Byron comes to equate Scotland, Scottish language, and Scottish culture with childhood and immaturity.

When the 5th Lord Byron died on 21 May, 1798, the Byrons' changes in circumstance were not immediately apparent, at least not financially, although, as Eislier observes, the move from northern Scotland to Newstead Abby marks a significant moment in the development of Byron's sense of national identity. She states that once in England, "Catherine Gordon Byron, ignorant and impoverished, object of pity or scorn, embodied the country he [Byron] was leaving behind with regret and relief" (33). This statement casts the weight of change more directly onto the crossing of geographic barriers and less onto inheriting the title, as Eisler also points out that while still in Scotland, the Byrons' living circumstances were not immediately changed upon Byron becoming the 6th Lord. Catherine Byron's financial difficulties necessitated that she sell furniture and downsize

[64] Fiona McCarthy also clarifies that this education involved a heavy emphasis on Latin literature and study (9).

their accommodations just to be able to afford the journey south to Newstead, which delayed the trip by several months, while her attorney petitioned John Hanson, the Byron family solicitor, for a portion of her son's inheritance to "[enable] her to live in that respectable state she is entitled to from the rank of her Son" (Eisler 31). The next few years were also plagued with repeated requests for financial aid, yet the privileges of rank and status alleviated the greatest majority of the stigma associated with such financial hardships, as Byron being a Ward of Chancery removed the necessity of relying on the sympathy of family and near relations for support.

Eisler's remark that Catherine Byron became an "object of pity or scorn," however, also carries significant meaning for Byron's understanding of national identity, as she touches on the recent history of Scottish-English conflict with the Jacobite uprisings of the eighteenth century. She explains that: "In England, to be a Scot by birth was a lifelong obstacle to preferment in public life" (Eisler 33) due to the prevalence of anti-Scottish stereotypes in England after the political tensions of the eighteenth century.[65] She goes on to assert that "the fear that trace elements of his early years would taint his complete acceptance as a gentleman among the Regency *ton*" (33) plagues Byron despite his professed love of the Highlands, while also noting that Thomas Moore, Byron's friend and biographer, records at least one instance of Byron reacting negatively to someone noticing residual traces of his Scottish accent. That Eisler emphasizes Byron's desire for acceptance as a *gentleman* is significant, in that it points to a correlation between nationality and behavior, or the relationship between nationality and the appearance of acceptability. This is present in many of the stereotypes associated with the Scottish Highlanders, as they rely on generalizing Scotland's

[65] Eisler makes a good point here about anti-Scottish sentiment within England, but her assessment is overly simplified and refers mainly to the stereotypes attributed primarily to Scottish Highlanders. On the other hand, such stereotypes were also applied to Highlanders by Lowland Scots. Aberdeenshire, where the Byrons resided, covers territory in both regions of northern Scotland. (More discussion on the differences between Highlanders and Lowlanders will be forthcoming.) (See Steier)

warrior-like past and recent political rebellions into a simplified and derogatory view of the Scottish as savages and moral degenerates. That his *mother*, a woman who also should technically possess the behaviors and attributes of nobility, signifies some of the worse elements of Scottish culture further contributes to the conflation of Englishness and gentlemanly conduct, as he comes to associate the mannerly conduct of English aristocracy inherited through his father with Englishness itself. For Byron, the symbols of rank and privilege are only realized in full once he has relocated to his father's family's English estate, leaving behind his Scottish heritage and its accompanying associations with poverty, embarrassment, and social struggle. Additionally, the sale of his mother's inheritance as part of the rise and fall of the Byron family's fortunes and the subsequent lack of a permanent residence symbolize the apparent uncertainty of Scottish identity, whereas Byron's title and remaining ancestral lands come to represent the perceived permanence of national identity associated with English aristocratic rank.

Scholarship and the Battle for the Bard

As one of the "Big Six" of Romanticism, Byron's place in the canon of British literature is largely a matter of accepted fact; his place in Scottish literature, however, has been more contested as his poetic style displays a curious mix of Scottish influence in terms of thematic content and (with few exceptions) the principles of classical literature taught within the English-dominated realm of academics. Some, like T.S. Eliot and Hugh MacDiarmid, have cited the influence of Robert Burns and Scottish tradition on Byron's poetry and used this to justify his inclusion as a Scottish poet, while others have outright claimed him as a Scottish poet by virtue of birth and residency alone. In Eliot's 1937 essay on Byron, he observes that Byron fits within a line of "Scottish" but not "Scots" poets as he writes in English and not the Scottish vernacular (224), and that his poetry exhibits a "peculiar

diabolism, his delight in posing as a damned creature" (225) that comes via the influence of Scottish Calvinism. Eliot's assertion seems to form the foundation for modern Byron studies, yet, more than forty years later, Roderick Speer describes Eliot's understanding of Byron's nationalist expression as flawed since, he says, it suffers from the mistake of overlooking Byron's awareness of his own Scottishness, a problem that seems to be naggingly persistent.[66] He also cites the lack of clear, systematic study from others on Byron's place within the Scottish canon in the interim, explaining that other studies "[err] to extremes of specificity or generality" (196-197) as they tend to focus on individual or small groups of poems for piecemeal examinations of Scottish themes that ignore the totality of Byron's works.[67] Another problem he cites is the tendency to point to biography alone as a justification for Byron's Scottishness (197), a mere observation that adds little to the understanding of Byron or his works as it focuses on the mere existence of Scottishness, but not on how it functions within the works.

This last criticism seems to persist to a degree even in more recent examinations of Byron and Scotland, as nearly every critic cites some version of Byron's declaration from the text of *Don Juan* that he was "half a Scot by birth, and bred / a whole one" (Canto X, Stanza XVII), while pointing to the influence of Calvinism and Scottish poetic tradition to support their claims. The important distinction to make here is, that although such criticism presents valid and insightful understanding of Byron's relationship to Scottish literature and its place within the *British* canon, such readings are clearly based on two principles: external perceptions of Byron's identity and Byron's national

[66] Speer bases this on Eliot's remark that (in a comparison of Byron and Scott) "Possibly Byron, who must have thought of himself as an English poet, was the more Scotch of the two because of being unconscious of his true nationality" (qtd in Speer 197). He says this statement was later removed from subsequent editions of the essay.
[67] Although I agree with the majority of Speers's assessment to this point, this type of approach is exactly what I propose to do here in limiting the scope to the relationship between *Hours of Idleness* and *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers.* See below.

identity as it develops over the course of his career, with the primary focus for scholars being his latter works such as *Don Juan*. Byron's statement in *Don Juan* offers his own perspective on his sense of nationality, yet this statement comes with the benefits of almost twenty years of maturity and cultural exposure through his travels. For my purposes, however, I am not interested so much in how others see Byron, but in how he, as a young man and fledgling poet, responded to the cultural and societal pressures imposed by his contemporaries, in how *EBSR* indicates Byron's own self-perception and self-identification as Scottish – or not –, and in how he saw himself as a poet in relation to his dual nationality. This emphasis on Byron's response at a particular moment in time, I believe, is important for understanding why it is that, although such Scottish themes and influences such as Calvinism and what Murray Pittock terms the "taxonomy of glory" (*Scottish and Irish Romanticism*) are prevalent throughout his works, Byron did not feel comfortable asserting his Scottish heritage again in print until the publication of Canto X of *Don Juan* in 1822, thirteen years after the publication of *Hours of Idleness.*

While Speer notes the lack of significant studies concerning Byron and Scotland prior to 1979, more recent attention has been given to Byron's apparently troubled relationship to Scotland.[68] Although these essays approach such disparate topics as Byron's radical politics, his connection to specific authors, and his relationship to "place" in general, each essay is grounded in the attachment between Byron and Scotland and how his sense of Scottish identity affects his works. In the following pages, I will evaluate these articles insofar as they discuss Byron's Scottish identity and the two works, *Hours of Idleness* and *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, which not only provided the foundation for Byron's published poetic career, but also are the first two works to mention

[68] including the essay collection *Byron and Scotland: Radical or Dandy?* (1989), edited by Angus Calder, and a special edition of *Studies in Romanticism* (Spring 2008), and the "Byron and Burns" edition of the *Byron Journal* (Spring 2011).

Scotland overtly. An examination of these scholarly articles reveals several telling commonalities, mainly the almost-universal dismissal of *Hours* as "synthetic" or "inessential" in its representation of Scottishness, while *EBSR* is likewise dismissed as either an abandonment or outright betrayal of Scottish heritage. These criticisms are the primary reason that scholars have tended to focus on Byron's later works, yet such blatant dismissal underestimates a critical moment in Byron's poetic and personal development, as these two works, with their drastically different approach to cultural heritage and poetic expression, represent Byron's first two formally published efforts.

In the introduction to *Byron and Scotland*, editor Angus Calder argues that "No one in their senses would claim that this [the Scottish] tradition wholly determined Byron's writing, but only a very obtuse person could miss the signs that his Scottish childhood left a strange mark on him" (2). Calder leaves this "strange mark" undefined before pointing out Byron's immersion in the tradition of classical literature, the academic standard taught throughout Britain and continental Europe. The sudden shift in topic at once raises and dismisses the issue of Byron's dual heritage without due consideration. He then claims that Byron's admiration of Pope and Churchill are the source of Byron's anti-Scottish invective in *EBSR*: "Innovative though he was elsewhere in form and feeling, Byron wrote couplet-satire as a follower of Pope and Churchill, and I think *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* and *The Curse of Minerva* reveal no serious anti-Scottish animus, rather a young poet's emulation of his predecessor: he drew from a bank of anti-Caledonian jibes" (2). This conclusion, however, overlooks several key elements of Byron's argument in *EBSR*, particularly the personal and extended nature of the attacks on Francis Jeffrey, the gendered tone of the attacks, and the direct contrast between the poem and Byron's previous collection. Whether inspired by his satirical idols or not, Byron's anti-Scottish invective in *EBSR* is an abrupt departure from the celebration (albeit limited and imperfect) of Scottishness found in *Hours of Idleness*. As an Irish Proverb states, "Great

hate follows great love," and the vehemence of Byron's reaction in *EBSR* presents an anomaly that has been repeatedly passed over but is worthy of investigation.

Few essays collected in *Byron and Scotland* offer extended discussions of *Hours* or *EBSR* and the point of national identity, and those that do seem to share in their dismissal of the poems and in an analysis of Byron's Scottishness as somehow inauthentic. Among these scholars are Andrew Noble and Margery McCulloch, as well as Stephen Cheeke. Noble arrives at a dismissal of *Hours* via the relationship between Byron's heritage, politics, and social status. He starts by pointing to Byron's scorn for the first-generation Romantic such as Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey who abandoned radical politics after The Terror, then contrasts Byron's lack of political efficacy at home with the radical politics he espoused once in Italy and Greece. He draws on Malcolm Kelsall's reading of *Marino Falierio* as a statement on the moral dilemma of supporting radicalism at the expense of the aristocratic system from which Byron draws security. He then asserts that this sense of self-preservation is exacerbated by Byron's Scottishness (37), an argument he supports by referencing Tom Nairn's assertions that the Scottish were "commercially and professionally integrated into British society to a degree that a commitment to a Scottish cause would have seemed socially and fiscally self-endangering" (38). It is this integration and self-interest that led Sir Walter Scott, and others of his genre, to create a literary version of Scottish nationalism filled with "inessential, 'romantic' symbols of Scottish nationalism while in reality being terrified of the resurrection of what he considered a rebarbative Scotland" (38). Noble's description of Scott's new and innocuous representation of Scottishness is what Byron draws on for *Hours of Idleness*, particularly in Byron's use of Ossianic styling and every-day cultural elements for added detail. However, Noble's argument falls short in that Byron's poems also include personal details relating to his family's involvement in the Uprising of 1745. This anecdote would seem to run counter to

Noble's argument by not only drawing attention to Byron's family's involvement in recent political radicalism, but also by demonstrating pride in his family history and potentially a sense of vicarious involvement that seems at odds with the theme of "self-preservation," but carries implications for the relationship between *Hours* and *EBSR*. The implication of this argument is that Brougham's scathing review of *Hours of Idleness* then functions as a correcting force that attempts to normalize Byron's national identity into one that does not endanger Scottish relations with England. Byron's counter-argument then, is to forego public mention of his heritage in favor of the "displaced nationalism" (39) Nobel asserts is a pattern of behavior exhibited by Scottish writers and that is found in Byron's later works in support of Italy and Greece.

Instead of politics, Margery McCullock's essay discusses the relationship between Byron and John Galt, author of one of many biographies of Byron to appear after his death, but she draws attention to Galt's failure to develop the consequences of Byron's dual nationality, and especially the offhandedly brief mention of the peculiarities of Byron's poetry as the result of Scottish influence. Her essay also offers more criticism of Galt than analysis of Byron, but by way of correcting Galt's mistakes, she offers a lengthy analysis of Byron's Scottish heritage and its relationship to his work. She quickly touches on both *Hours of Idleness* and *EBSR*; these mentions, however, are not favorable. She dismisses the poem "I would I were a careless child" (and by extension all of *Hours of Idleness*) as "something of an exercise in rhetoric and role-playing" given its similarities to Coleridge's "To the River Otter" (80). Then, she remarks that "On the whole, Byron appears to have accepted willingly his transformation from penniless, if honourably descended, Scotsman to English lord" (80), before noting the emphasis on *English* bards in the title of *EBSR*, as well as the decided lack of Scottish influence present in his work. She says that "He does not draw on the Scots language that must have been part of his childhood background. Nor does he draw on

Scottish themes, nor, consciously, on the Scottish literary tradition in his work" (81). In this latter comment, McCulloch's argument is sound – Byron *does* ally himself with England and present himself as an *English* bard throughout his works, at least in deliberate stylistic and thematic choices. Yet, that his primary style should reflect the classical literary tradition and language of the educated classes is also worthy of note, although this detail is one McCulloch, like Calder, fails to consider. While she, unlike many others, attempts to reference both works, the overall tone of her remarks on these early poetic endeavors is dismissive and paints Byron's nationalist expression as disingenuous, similar to the argument waged by Noble's discussion of the "inessential, 'romanticized'" version of Scottishness present in the works of Scott and others. This assessment of Byron's early work as an exercise in rhetoric also seems insufficient to explain the force of Byron's reaction in *EBSR*, as Byron takes as much time attacking and dismantling Scottishness in the latter as he did praising it in the former.

Stephen Cheeke also calls attention to the perceived inauthenticity of Byron through the concept of the "commonplace – the second hand and inauthentic emotional response" (5) used when representing place and history within Byron's poetry. He says that "Authenticity then is a central topic of this study, part of the argument of which will be to suggest not only that an anxiety about responding to places of historical fame is a central part of Byron's imagination, but that the idea of the commonplace becomes transformed in the use Byron makes of his actual experience and direct knowledge of such places gained in his travels" (5-6). Unlike other scholars who focus almost entirely on Byron's later body of works, Cheeke also applies this analysis to Byron's early career, the publication of *Hours of Idleness* and *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, and Byron's memories of Scotland and the Highlands. He concludes that "Byron's own sense of Scotland [is] as a place that can only be experienced in relation to and in terms of other places, a place authentically

*in*authentic, but also of course a place constantly recalled by other places, and therefore inescapable and unforgettable" (emphasis his, 36). Cheeke's assessment of Byron's Scotland as "inauthentic" carries into his valuation of Byron's "synthetic" (34) Scottish nostalgia in the Preface to *Hours of Idleness*. *Hours* is in and of itself a "complex notion of identity, ordered and split around two places, one of which is being left behind while the other is proleptically imagined" (16), an apt assessment of Byron's blending of history and present day, Scottish and English themes throughout the collection. He concludes that this motif leads to "fashioning the self through the meaning of *place*, answering the needs of identity through physical situation and material historical memory" (17). According to Cheeke, however, *EBSR* trades "synthetic" nostalgia for "the degraded nature of place," stereotypes, and a mock-heroic sense of Scottishness (35). Although he notes the uneasiness and uncertainty found in the "embarrassed posturing" (35) of *Hours of Idleness*, Cheeke sees similarities in the "uncertainty and slipperiness of belonging" (35) in *EBSR.*

Bernard Beatty perhaps offers the most detailed and relevant analysis of Byron and his sense of personal Scottish identity in "The Force of 'Celtic memories' in Byron's thought." In this essay, Beatty examines the various minutiae of Scottish references throughout Byron's works, ultimately declaring that "These details are worth tracking because Byron's poetry is a poetry of ancestry in a way that is not true of any of his great contemporaries…An aristocrat is someone who knows their own ancestry as a public fact. Byron is self-consciously such" (106). Toward the end of Byron's career in particular, Beatty argues that Byron's Scottish references in *Don Juan* and *The Island* constitute a "knowingly resumed identity" (108-109), a line of argument in keeping with the focus of other scholars who focus on Byron's more mature works. Beatty, however, is also the only scholar so far to offer any extended analysis of Byron's sense of identity in *Hours of Idleness* and *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, yet he seems to deny the strength of Scottish sentiment in

Hours of Idleness. He notes that Byron's work draws from several non-Scottish sources such as Newstead Abbey and Southwell, as well as the assertion that "Byron nowhere suggests that he is actually a Scot, either Highlander or Lowlander, in any sense" (103). On the other hand, in *EBSR*, "a much more mediated appearance before the audience he intended to reach, he in effect denies his Scottishness altogether" (104). He explains Byron's apparent disavowal of his Scottish ancestry as an attempt to adapt to the social pressure of English aristocratic society and the expectations attached to his English title, then cites Byron's change in name, as well as his attempts to eradicate his Scottish accent as further evidence of these efforts. Yet Beatty appears to overlook the references in *Hours of Idleness* to Byron's family involvement at Culloden, and the actual wording of the poem "Song," that starts with the statement "When I roved a young Highlander." Instead, Beatty takes the wording from Byron's Preface, a text well-known for its attempts at posing and special pleading, where he says that he was "accustomed in my younger days to rove a careless mountaineer on the Highlands of Scotland…" (Beatty 103). Admittedly, Byron's preface and personal notations strike an odd balance between detachment and first-hand experience, yet if Byron had been so determined to distance himself from his Scottish ancestry, why include these references at all? Byron's display of Scottish national identity within the text of *Hours of Idleness* and *EBSR* would appear to be more complex than Beatty assumes.

Beatty's argument that Byron "gives up Scottish ancestors for English, and English for continental" is similar to the argument made by Alan Rawes as he reflects on Byron's changing sense of identity throughout his career. These changes ultimately lead to a transformation of identities and Byron's eventual cosmopolitanism, yet Rawes also spends significant time discussing Byron's early career and Scottish heritage. He begins discussing the place Byron holds in the Scottish canon by first listing the various arguments made in support of his inclusion, before

broaching his own assessment of Byron the Scottish poet versus Byron the English Lord. He says that:

> By the time he was writing *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, having attended Harrow and Cambridge, he had aligned himself with a very English literary tradition and cast himself very much as an English bard. George Bayron Gordon, as his name was entered in the Aberdeen Grammar School register, transformed himself into Lord Byron, English public schoolboy and aristocratic Cambridge undergraduate of Norman lineage (178).

The remainder of his argument discusses the ways in which Byron's sense of national identity shifts and ultimately broadens throughout his life in accordance with his wanderings. Rawes asserts that "As he adopted an English rather than a Scottish identity on moving to England, so he adopted a European identity rather than his English one when he went abroad" (178). Although Rawes's essay turns to discussing the implications of such identity shifts in Byron's later works, the evaluation of Byron's identity in both statements is worth lingering over for the perspective it brings to his relationship with Scotland and England. Firstly, Rawes draws attention to the change in name and title between Scotland and England, a seemingly insignificant detail at first glance, but one that hints at meaningful consequences Rawes neglects to develop. As the name in and of itself carries the weight of national as well as *personal* identity, the heavily Scots accented spelling present in "George Bayron Gordon" as well as the use of his mother's familial name signifies the depth of Scottish belonging. This sense of belonging is disturbed by the sudden shift to his English title, a somewhat traumatizing event as biographers recount the anecdote of young Byron bursting into tears at the first reading of the roll and his new name of "Georgius Dominus de Byron" (Eisler 30), as well as his naïve urge to ask his mother "whether 'she perceived any difference in him since he had

been made a lord as he perceived none himself" (Moore, qtd in Eisler 30). This name change signifies a shift in identity, but one that is not completed until Byron's relocation to England and subsequent immersion in the English aristocratic system.

While Beatty and Rawes focus on Byron's cosmopolitan and multi-cultural development, Michael Steier takes this cosmopolitan angle and combines it with a thread of argument proposed in Cheeke's essay, that of the differences between Highland and Lowland Scots, a point neglected in discussions by other scholars. Specifically, he applies this discussion to *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* and argues that Byron's shifting attitude toward English and Scottish literati signals the origin of Byron's later cosmopolitanism.[69] He declares that "throughout *EBSR*, Byron demarcates the literary transgressions of Britain's bards while simultaneously setting, negotiating, and ultimately transgressing the geographic and cultural boundaries that tie him to both England and Scotland" (38) and that "Byron employs Scottish stereotypes not only from an English perspective, but he also perpetuates stereotypes about the Scottish Lowlanders from a northern Scottish perspective" (39). As Linda Colley points out in *Britons*, socio-cultural differences between Highland and Lowland Scots on the basis of language, religion, education, ethnicity and culture created unfavorable stereotypes on each side. While Highlanders viewed their Lowland cousins as "Sassenage," or outsiders, culturally and linguistically more English than Scottish, Lowlanders viewed the Highland inhabitants as "members of a different and inferior race, violent, treacherous, poverty-stricken and backward. They called them savages or aborigines, labels that some Lowlanders continued to use well into the 1830s" (Colley 15). In claiming the identity of a Highlander, Byron subjects himself to these stereotypes associated with Highland culture,

[69] I, however, am limiting the scope of my argument here to the relationship between *Hours of Idleness* and *EBSR*. Byron's more mature poetry, including his later cosmopolitanism, is better discussed in the context of "Ex-patriot Satire."

particularly from Lowlanders such as Brougham. By recognizing this Highland/Lowland divide, Steier's argument reveals an important but previously overlooked distinction in Byron's seemingly contradictory expression of national identity. However, Steier limits his examination of the text in two ways: firstly, by focusing on Byron's attacks on the reviewers and disregarding the satire on contemporary authors, and secondly by examining the text of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* only as a response to Brougham's review and not as a point of development in relation to Byron's earlier poetic collection, *Hours of Idleness*. These two limitations create a reading that, while insightful, forms an incomplete picture of Byron's treatment of non-English identity within *EBSR*.

A new thread of inquiry is opened by Brean Hammond when he argues that early childhood shaped Byron into a Scottish poet based on more recent research in psychology and sociology that concludes personality is dependent upon the experiences and influences of early childhood (150), although the scope and purpose of the essay precludes further discussion. The essay is one of a series included in *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Romanticism*, and serves as more of an introductory article on Byron rather than a sustained analysis. However, Hammond's work synthesizes several major lines of inquiry to posit a rather damning portrait of Byron's early sense of Scottish identity expressed in *Hours* and *EBSR*. He opens by summarizing the debate on Byron's nationality and place in either the English or Scottish literary canons, then moves on to discuss the poems. In *Hours*, he says, "the identity of a Scotsman was one that he [Byron] adopted – though amongst the several postures of that ill-fated preface, it is hard to say with what degree of commitment" (150). Hammond takes this wavering or dubious sincerity as "symptomatic of the difficult Anglicisation process he was then undergoing" (151), although he foregoes developing more detailed discussion of what this process is or how it further affected Byron's works. However, Hammond takes Byron's anti-Scottish abuse in *EBSR* as validation that any national identity

expressed within *Hours of Idleness* was "strategic rather than deeply felt" (151). He then uses *EBSR* to negate Byron's place in the Scottish canon, calling the poem a "cultural betrayal" (152): "This poem, whatever its other merits, plays a part in occluding Byron's place in any Scottish tradition of Romantic writing or in a Scottish national culture. In its Manichean structure, 'bards' are English and are virtuous, whereas reviewers – critics – are Scottish and are uncreative parasites" (151-152). Hammond, like many others before, seems content to dismiss *Hours* based on the abrupt reversal of sentiment in *EBSR* rather than to consider what may have prompted such a reversal, particularly as he notes that Byron's future works tended to "[gaze] on foreign lands through a Scots telescope" (152).

"To Auld Lang Syne": Establishing the value of Hours of Idleness *and* English Bards and Scotch Reviewers

Aside from Michael Steier's analysis of Byron's use of the Highland/Lowland divide in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, the critical arguments surrounding *Hours of Idleness* and *EBSR* present a somewhat disjointed and repetitive view. The reason for this fragmented thread of argument is that, quite plainly, most scholars seem to have little interest in *EBSR* and even less interest in *Hours of Idleness*. As Hammond and others have noted, given the posturing present in the Preface to *Hours of Idleness*, his apparent rejection of Scottishness in *EBSR*, and Byron's notoriously slippery persona in subsequent works, one might ask whether the expression of Scottish identity present in *Hours of Idleness* is, in fact, a sincere one. Peter Graham argues that despite the sense of "borrowed nostalgia" ("Expatriate Nostalgia" 77) present in the poems, that this "nostalgia rings true" (77). He says that it is "easy to mock such posturing, were it not rooted in genuine feeling, were it not that the nostalgia of expatriation will endure, mature, and be voiced in more sophisticated ways throughout Byron's career" (78). One example of this more mature tone is found in the "Auld Lang Syne" stanzas of *Don Juan,* when Byron remarks that "I am half a Scot by birth, and bred / a whole

one," the first print acknowledgement of his Scottish heritage since *Hours of Idleness*. In these stanzas, Byron emphasizes his boyhood and youth by focusing on such things as his "boy feelings" and exploits in Scotland as a youth (a primary motif throughout the poems in *Hours of Idleness*) before culminating in the statement that such reminiscence packages "my childhood in this childishness of mine." Even as an adult, Byron seems to associate Scotland with immaturity as he dismisses his sense of nostalgia as "childishness," an assertion that also rejects his earlier poetry about Scotland and his youth as stylistically, emotionally, and intellectually juvenile.

In contrast, the "Auld Lang Syne" verses of *Don Juan* indicate a more mature and nuanced awareness of this identity than that which is found in *EBSR*, primarily in the absence of overtly dismissive aggression toward Scotland. The lack of aggression may be in part the result of the *ottava rima* stanza and the overall Horatian tone of the poem, yet Byron's address to Jeffrey in Stanzas XVI and XVII stresses a sense of honor and masculine behavior as opposed to the dismissive feminizing found in the martial tone of *EBSR.* In these verses, Byron's poetic and national identity demonstrate maturity by acknowledging and analyzing past behavior as well as by subjecting his own voice in *EBSR* to the same criticisms of gender and maturity levelled at other poets within the work, particularly when he states in Stanza XIX

> And though, as you remember, in a fit
> Of wrath and rhyme, when juvenile and curly,
> I railed at Scots to shew my wrath and wit,
> Which must be owned was sensitive and surly,
> They cannot quench young feelings fresh and early:
> I '*scotched*, not killed,' the Scotchman in my blood,
> And love the land of 'mountain and of flood'. (145-152)

In these lines, Byron's admission of his own youthful "wrath" and "sensitivity" contrast to the "most [noble]" behavior he attributes to Jeffrey, an indication that in his paradigm of national identity, Byron is only able to acknowledge a countryman when he is able to accept his opponent's behavior as conforming to the standards of accepted masculine conduct associated with genteel society and the aristocracy. Yet here, Byron does more than accept Jeffrey, as most of Stanza XVI is devoted to an apology and "toast." Byron's insistent apology and recognition, as he says "I own it from my soul" (128), is an important step in fulfilling the expectations of masculine behavior and aristocratic rank, as the insults delivered in print in *EBSR* require formal apology, likewise in print. That Byron wraps this apology in multiple references to "Auld Lang Syne," Burn's poem recalling old friendships while bidding goodbye to the past, demonstrates not only Byron's acknowledgement of shared cultural and national identity, but also an acknowledgement of equality, as Byron regrets that he cannot "take my wine / with you […] in your proud city" (131-132).

This paradigm of masculinity is first rooted in Byron's response to Brougham's review in *EBSR*, a point that becomes particularly clear when *EBSR* is contrasted with earlier responses to criticisms, "To Those Ladies Who Have So Kindly Defended the Author from the Attacks of Unprovoked Malignity" (1806) and "To a Knot of Ungenerous Critics" (1806). According to McGann's notes, both poems address criticisms of Byron's privately circulated collection, *Fugitive Pieces*, the earlier iteration of *Hours of Idleness*. The first poem is addressed to Byron's female supporters, and while he describes his detractors as the "lying Throng" (9), his attention is more strategically focused on his female audience by confessing his "Harp of Love" (29) and "artless Songs" (a phrase he repeats twice in Stanza 9, lines 34 and 36), while praising their intellect and sexual purity, characteristics bundled within the lines "The Minds of fair untainted Maids / From Verse will still remain the same" (37-38). The poem as a whole is more concerned with courting his

audience, seemingly deliberately flaunting the "warm" tone of *Fugitive Pieces* that had prompted the original criticisms. In the second poem, Byron addresses his critics directly, dubbing them a "heartless crew" (1, 85) who spout "varnished Lies" (38) because they are unable to write or connect emotionally to the work, particularly the "portly Female" of line 48. His tone throughout the satire remains martial, in accordance with the Juvenalian tone of the attack, while his verse itself addresses only issues of virtue and purity, as Byron defends his own verse against the critics he sees as overly-scrupulous and motivated by jealousy. Together, these poems demonstrate the classical satiric principle of uniformity in addressing only the classical satiric topics of sexual virtue and poetic ability. Both poems function in such a way to assert the speaker's masculine authority, first through the courtship of his female readership and then by adherence to classical literary standards. Yet both poems, significantly, are devoid of any mentions of national identification, suggesting that the later anti-Scottish and anti-foreign themes found in *EBSR* are a direct response to Brougham's pointed criticism of Byron's expression of Scottishness.

When Byron responds with his seemingly anti-Scottish rhetoric in *EBSR*, he demonstrates an attempt to assert his identity through what he sees as the more mature and masculine genre of Augustan (i.e. English) satire and to distance himself from the immature and effeminate fluff poetry of sentimentally historical pieces, as well as from the feminized and infantilized stereotypes of Scotland, stereotypes to which he himself had conformed and subsequently promoted within *Hours of Idleness*. As Graham also asserts that throughout Byron's career he tends to "cloak and mask his feeling in exotic otherness offered by foreign places and personae" (79), so in the instance of *EBSR*, Byron's "exotic otherness" is complicated and contradictory – he simultaneously embraces the English "Sassenage" identity of his boyhood in his poetic style, while also expressing attitudes and beliefs similar to those of Scottish Highlanders. This tension and contradiction is indicative of

Byron's struggles with a dual national heritage in which one nationality is considered, by public perception, to be inferior. When Beatty and Rawes argue that Byron's identity is somewhat malleable and influenced by his travels abroad, their arguments also potentially point to issues of insecurity and the attempt to find belonging. Unlike Burns and Moore who seem secure in their self-identification as Scottish and Irish and merely sought outward acceptance by the dominant culture of England, Byron's fluctuating and unstable expressions of both Scottish and English belonging indicate subconscious efforts to both identify and come to terms with this dual nationality.

Hours of Idleness *and the* Edinburgh Review*: the identity crisis preceding* EBSR

Byron's first poetic publication, *Hours of Idleness*, consists of a remade version of two earlier volumes, *Fugitive Pieces* (1806) and *Poems on Various Occasions* (1807), both of which had only been circulated privately among his Southwell coterie. *Hours*, however, in comparison to the other volumes, was highly sanitized, as his friends had complained that a number of the pieces included were "too warm" for general circulation. As Graham explains in his biography of Byron, in the final copy, "What was liveliest had been skimmed off the adolescent effusion; what was blandest remained for general circulation when the poet-peer made his bow to the reading public beyond Southwell" (*Lord Byron*, 12). The remaining poems consisted largely of translations and occasional pieces that Graham asserts are "best characterized as a collection of schoolboy verse" (12), a description readily discernable by such titles as "Fragments of school exercises," and "Thoughts on a College Examination," and that Byron himself seemingly admits in his Preface when he says that the poems "bear the internal evidence of a boyish mind." The remaining poems, however, include several pieces that are either Ossianic imitations or nostalgic poems based on his youth in Scotland.

In his essay "Byron and Expatriate Nostalgia," Graham repeats his description, with a slight alteration: "Much of the nostalgia voiced in *Hours of Idleness* comes across as borrowed – given how many of the poems are close to being schoolboy exercises in imitation – but the nostalgic feelings for the Scotland Byron left behind ring true, not least because the notes continue to resonate throughout his subsequent career" (77). Among these were the Ossianic "Oscar of Alva" and "The Death of Calmar and Orla," the latter of which Byron describes specifically as an imitation of James Macpherson's *Ossian*, and the nostalgic poems "Lachin y Gair," "Song," and "Stanzas – I would I were a careless child," the last two being added to the second edition of *Hours of Idleness*.[70]

In the first two poems, "Oscar of Alva" and "The Death of Calmar and Orla," Byron adopts stylistic elements[71] from *Ossian* as well as the motifs of glory and heroism, although he derives plot material from Viergil, Shakespeare, and Frederich Schiller. The *Ossianic* elements borrowed emphasize the role of clan culture and the warrior past associated with the Highlands, transforming familiar classical and English stories into works steeped in Scottish culture. The plot of "Oscar of Alva" revolves around the disappearance of the Clan Chieftain's heir, Oscar, just before his wedding and the ensuing two-year mystery, which ultimately reveals a Cain-and-Abel-style rivalry and murder. In his notes, Byron acknowledges his debt to Schiller's unfinished novel, *Der Geisterseher*,[72] in particular the storyline involving Jeronymo and Lorenzo and also declares the influence of Act III of *MacBeth*, Shakespeare's well-known Scottish play. Various details throughout the narrative emphasize the role of clan traditions and customs, including the "Pibroch" (Byron's mistaken

[70] Both poems were first included in the 2nd edition of *Hours of Idleness* in which several new poems replaced earlier pieces. McGann differentiates the volumes by referencing the second edition according to the subtitle, *Poems Original and Translated (POT)*, which was released in March 1808, after the publication of the *Edinburgh Review* article had appeared in January. (*CPW*, 366 and 376)

[71] McGann references Wilmsen on this point.

[72] Byron was acquainted to the work through a "wretched translation" (McGann, 46n) by W. Render called *The Armenian: or, The Ghost-Seer* (1800).

substitution of a term indicating a style of music in place of the instrument used, the bagpipe); the clan gatherings mentioned in stanzas 10, 14, 23, and 45; as well as the clan tartans mentioned in stanza 23, the unique patterns of plaid associated with each Highland family. The second poem, "The Death of Calmar and Orla," ends with the tragic death of both heroes in battle, a more specific nod to Scotland's primitive and militaristic national history. Byron openly states the poem is an imitation of *Ossian* and it maintains the broken narrative associated with Macpherson's work, becoming, like *Ossian*, a story "held together 'not by unified action or theme […] but by the presence of [its] narrator'" (Fiona Stafford, qtd in McNeil 29). Even though Byron's debt to Macpherson extends to character names as well as style, his notes indicate the source material for the work as the story of Nisus and Euryalus from Virgil's *Aneid*, blending Augustan tradition with the Scottish national tale.

This blending, however, is problematic and incomplete, ultimately undercutting the cultural national identity the poems initially seem to promote. Both of Byron's poems highlight the role of clan culture and the warrior past associated with the Scottish Highlands, an emphasis that gives precedence to a feeling of nationalism within the poems not only by promoting a sense of shared cultural history, but also by recalling a time in which Scotland was self-governing, just as Macpherson's *Ossian* had attempted to provide a sense of Scottish identity based on ancient racial and cultural origins (McNeil 32-33). The references to Scotland's warrior-like past also recall an image of the Highland warrior as what Kenneth McNeil terms in *Scotland, Britain, Empire: Writing the Highlands, 1760-1860*, a "hero-soldier," an image linking heroism, masculinity, nationalism, and warfare (85). Yet this image stands at odds with the concept of civil masculinity associated with the gentility and aristocracy, a contrast Byron's more genteel and Lowland audiences would have found distasteful, as such images seemingly confirm or repeat the stereotypes of Scottish Highlanders as

warmongering savages. The sense of national identity is then undermined by the poems' origins in classical Augustan, modern English, and German poetry, instead of the native folklore and mythology that provide the foundations for Macpherson's *Ossian*. By adopting *Ossian*'s style without its content, Byron demotes the national identity found in Macpherson's original to an easily imitated literary formula, thereby robbing the imitation of much of its cultural significance. Furthermore, the imitative nature of Byron's poems gives the impression of an impersonal intellectual and historical perspective rather than the informed perception of a Scottish native. Such an approach ultimately reveals the limitations of Byron's Scottish cultural exposure (as evidenced by such errors as his mistaken substitution of Pibroch for bagpipe), discrediting his own authority and destabilizing the nationalism suggested by the poem's *Ossianic* elements.

The poem "Lochin y Gair" presents a more subjective narrative by expressing nostalgia for Byron's childhood, although this expression of personal Scottish identity also remains problematic and fractured. An introductory paragraph before the poem explains, for the benefit of his English readers, the proper pronunciation of the mountain's name and its geographic location, details that would seemingly demonstrate his awareness of Scottish dialect and landscape, giving him the appearance of a cultural insider. He then includes a comment from a "Tourist" who speculates that the mountain is "the highest mountain perhaps in Great Britain" before giving his own aesthetic description of the landmark. He ends the paragraph by explaining that a portion of his early life had been spent nearby and signals that his own personal experience inspired the verses to follow. The overall effect of compounding the personal details is to privilege subjective experience, a technique he maintains throughout the early verses of the poem. The first verse rejects the (presumably) English "gardens of roses" (1) and "luxury" (2) in favor of the rough Highland landscape, which he declares is "sacred to freedom and love" (4). This description, contrasting presumably English

gardens with the rough Scottish Highland landscape, helps to connect nationality and gender by first aligning England with the un-masculine concept of "luxury." On the other hand, Scotland's landscape automatically evokes visions of the rugged, masculine Highland warrior (McNeil) while also linking this image with, significantly, "freedom and love," two words that signify both national and personal belonging. The ending line that he "[sighs] for the valley of dark Loch na Garr" (9) emphasizes his sense of nostalgia for a landscape and country in which he feels personally invested. Subsequently, Byron's own experiences, memories, and sense of belonging are emphasized, as he recounts his youthful exploits in the Highlands. He says that "There my young footsteps, in infancy, wander'd / My cap was the bonnet, my cloak was the plaid" (10). The personal recollections in the lines, particularly the word "wandered," suggest not only the carefree youth of the speaker, but also a sense of active and comfortable participation in Scottish identity. In the next lines, Byron turns his attention more directly to Highland culture with references to long-dead "chieftains" and "heroes" and the tragic battle of Culloden, significantly adding in his notes to the text the information that his maternal ancestors, the Gordons, had been allied with the Stuarts and had fought in favor of "the unfortunate Prince Charles, better known by the name of the Pretender" (Byron, 61.25n) during the ill-fated battle, a reference that implies Byron's own (perceived) inheritance of the strong warrior-masculinity associated with the Highlands.

In total, the details given, Byron's knowledge of the pronunciation and the geographic description, the emphasis on his own personal experience and suggested rejection of English culture, and his detailed account of family connections to the Scottish Highlands, imply a strong sense of self-identification as Scottish. Byron, however, also demonstrates his cultural and national remoteness in several subtle, but significant ways. The first of these incidents occurs in the juxtaposition of Byron's own experience and first-hand knowledge with that of the "Tourist"

mentioned in the introductory paragraph, a contrast that appears to give the experiences of a sightseer or vacationer (someone possessing merely passing or casual familiarity with Scottish culture) equal weight as the experiences of someone who affects the persona of a Scottish native, or at least someone with advanced knowledge of the land and its inhabitants. Furthermore, although Byron proudly proclaims his maternal family's involvement in the battle of Culloden, he notably refers to Charles Stewart, the eldest son of James Stewart, the Catholic claimant to the throne of England, as "The Pretender," a term that allies Byron politically and culturally more with his English heritage than his mother's recent Jacobite ancestors. He revises this term to "Bonnie Prince Charlie" in the notes to line 27, but the mix of political and cultural sympathies suggested by the contradictory appellations remains indicative of an unstable or divided sense of self-identification as either Scottish or English. This divided sense of identity also shows as the reader contrasts the image of the heroic Highland warriors found in "Oscar of Alva," "The Death of Calmar and Orla," and Byron's own ancestry with the likeness of a small schoolboy, now an English Lord, stumbling his way through the Highland mountains in the same plaid garment as the heroes of old. The image presents a contrast in both age and station, as well as demonstrations of masculinity that undermines the expression of nationality in the volume as a whole. Finally, although the poem is primarily auto-biographical, Byron still employs the technique of imitation, as the poem closely resembles Thomas Campbell's "Exile of Erin" in both theme and style. Campbell's poem is written from the perspective of an Irish emigrant or expatriate expressing nostalgia for his homeland, a theme Byron likewise expresses through the longing for his childhood and the Scottish Highlands. The "Irish Exile" has presumably been forced out of his homeland by "famine and danger" (Campbell 11) and left to reside in a "far foreign land" (Campbell 19) never to return, whereas Byron's speaker vaguely implies that he left voluntarily, or at least in more favorable conditions, and

still possesses the option to return when he says that "Years have roll'd on, Loch na Garr, since I left you, / Years must elapse, e'er I tread you again" (33-34). The difference between the speakers is in the degree to which each has been excluded from his homeland, with Byron's speaker garnering less sympathy in comparison due to the lack of severity or permanence in his "exile." In this framework, the personal nature of Byron's poem, expressed in the consistent use of the first person throughout, actually works against him as his sense of national exclusion is limited to personal experience, whereas the unnamed narrator of Campbell's poem functions as an example of synecdoche and represents the whole of the Irish diaspora.

Thus the volume that first appeared to the public in late June 1807 presented a gloss of Scottish nationalism and national identity, but one that Scottish natives could and *would* find lacking in authenticity and sincerity, just as critics found fault with Byron's attempts to assert his maturity and poetic ability. Even though *Hours of Idleness* initially received favorable reviews and decent sales, reviewers from *The Satirist*, the *Monthly Mirror*, and the *Edinburgh Review* found fault with the immature verse as well as Byron's emphasis on his own youth and status as presented in the Preface. The immaturity of the verse itself, combined with Byron's self-defeating emphasis on his minority left the volume open to the scathing review, written by Henry Brougham, but published anonymously, in the January 1808 *Edinburgh Review*. In *Byron: Life and Legend*, Fiona McCarthy describes Byron's tone in the preface as "[nurturing] the dilettante status of the aristocrat-writer, the talented young lord throwing off a few verses in the night hours after his social events" (62), an attitude that saturates the preface and even marks the volume's title, *Hours of Idleness*. Reviewers latched on to Byron's vacillating attempts to plead minority while professing a seemingly hollow desire for honest criticism, yet Brougham's criticism in the *Edinburgh Review* is by far the most vicious of these reviews and adeptly strikes at several of Byron's vulnerabilities, including age,

status, poetic ability, and his Scottish heritage. Brougham's attacks on Byron's sense of Scottishness reveal not only Byron's pre-existing and unacknowledged sense of divided national identity but also the ways in which it is as immature and undeveloped as his poetic abilities.

Brougham first attacks Byron's age, noting that "the noble author is peculiarly forward in pleading minority. […] Much stress is laid upon it in the preface; and the poems are connected with this general statement of his case, by particular dates substantiating the age at which each was written" (285) and that Byron "does allude frequently to his family and ancestors" (285). He also critiques Byron's poetic abilities, particularly Byron's reliance on translation and imitation. He critiques Byron's technique and lack of "liveliness" and "fancy" (286), yet his sharpest criticisms emphasize specifically Byron's partiality toward Ossianic imitation:

> As to his Ossianic poesy, we are not very good judges, being in truth, so moderately skilled in that species of composition, that we should, in all probability, be criticizing some bit of the genuine Macpherson itself. (287)

And, after quoting a portion of "The Death of Calmar and Orla," he declares:

> Of this kind of thing there are no less than *nine* pages; and we can so far venture an opinion in their favor, that they look very like Macpherson; and we are positive they are pretty nearly as stupid and tiresome. (288)

In the next paragraph, Brougham draws attention to Byron's maternal family and childhood in Scotland, only to criticize and belittle Byron's incorrect use of the word "pibroch" (288). After another slap at Byron's poetic abilities, Brougham ends the piece by offering his thanks that "'it is highly improbable, from his situation and pursuits hereafter,' that he should again condescend to become an author" (289), quoting Byron's Preface in order to turn his own words against him.

Marchand aptly describes the review as "unnecessarily provocative and meanly personal" (148) for Brougham's unrelenting attack on Byron's age and status before criticizing his poetic ability, but Brougham's focus on the Ossianic imitations and his attitude toward Macpherson's originals is suggestive of lingering elements of Scottophobia, the tendency to view the Scottish, and Highlanders in particular, as poor, illiterate, and alien.[73] Such sentiment, however, seems out of place given that Brougham himself was a Scot writing for the *Edinburgh Review*. Yet, if this bias was so unlikely, then why such hostility toward the Ossianic imitations in particular? The answer, at least in part, lies in lingering debates surrounding the authenticity and role of Macpherson's work in the Scottish nationalist dialogue. The most famous of these debates is the infamous literary argument between English author and critic Samuel Johnson and Macpherson himself, a debate that cast doubt on the work's authenticity during Macpherson's own time and has led to lingering controversy. Despite this, scholars, such as Katie Trumpener, recognize *Ossian*'s role in eighteenth-century Scotland as a hallmark of the nationalist antiquarian movement, a key text in which Scottish culture pre-English occupation is revived and celebrated under the sign of the Bard. However, McNeil reveals additional arguments against Macpherson's work when he argues that:

> By focusing on Johnson's attack on Macpherson's work, Trumpener, as do many other critics, reads the nationalist dimension of the Ossian debate along an English/Scottish fault line. […] Though a large proportion of the Scottish literati, as we have seen, zealously took up the cause of Ossian, Scots were not united in their

[73] Linda Colley discusses the Scottophobia mania present in the latter half of the 18th century in *Britons* (113-119) as the result of John Wilkes's efforts to publicly combat the term "British" and protect the English national identity against "an all-embracing and non-Anglocentric Great Britain. Scottish difference, Wilkes implied, was a guarantee that traditional Englishness *and* English primacy within the Union would remain intact" (118, emphasis Colley).

> praise of Ossian, and many of Ossian's detractors *within* Scotland were as adamant as Johnson in opposing Macpherson's claims. (32)

One such detractor was James Pinkerton, whose *Enquiry into the History of Scotland* (1789) consisted of a book-length rebuttal to Macpherson's arguments for *Ossian*'s authenticity and value for the nationalist movement. This argument, McNeil summarizes, discredits the Highlanders as "late-arriving upstarts from Ireland, [who] as Celts, had shown themselves through history to be incapable of advanced learning or literature" and that the work "promotes a nationalism that ironically affirms the backwardness of the Highland Gaels" (33).

With his attacks on Byron's poetic ability and education, Brougham certainly appears to think that Byron is "incapable of advanced learning or literature," as he says that "very poor verses were written by a youth from his leaving school to his leaving college […and] that it happens in the life of nine men in ten who are educated in England; and that the tenth man writes better verse than Lord Byron" (285). His criticism, however, goes beyond merely marginalizing Byron's Scottishness as that of an undesirable Highlander, to completely undercutting it, giving the outward perception of Byron as an Englishman co-opting Scottish culture for literary advantage. He chastises Byron's professed pride in his ancestry, both English and Scottish when he declares that

> It is a sort of privilege of poets to be egotists; but they should 'use it as not abusing it;' and particularly one who piques himself (though indeed at the ripe age of nineteen), of being 'an infant bard,' – ('The artless Helicon I boast is youth;') – should either not know, or should seem not to know, so much about his own ancestry (288).

He ends the paragraph by pointing out Byron's errors in Scottish language and culture, the heritage of his maternal line, when he declares that Byron "might have learnt that a *pibroch* is not a bagpipe,

any more than duet means a fiddle" (288). The condescending tone of the closing remark itself effectively dismantles Byron's attempted display of cultural knowledge in "Oscar of Alva" by bringing a simple mistake to light. Such comments, however, portray Byron as culturally ignorant of his own heritage by pointing out the deficiencies in his own knowledge and experience of the Highlands, revealing the tenuous nature of Byron's sense of Scottish identity. The overall effect of Brougham's comments is to suggest that Byron is too immature, poetically and culturally, to understand the fullness of his own ancestry and the national identity (or identities) it entails. He ends the review by mocking Byron's comments in the preface that although he had "'once roved a careless mountaineer in the Highlands of Scotland,' he has not of late enjoyed this advantage" (289), a comment that once again highlights Byron's lack of exposure to the Scottish culture he so readily claims as well as points out Byron's actual physical absence from Scotland. For Brougham's purposes, Byron is no more than a one-time tourist, rather than a Scottish native. More importantly, however, Brougham's comments bring this issue of cultural identity before the reading public. By calling out Byron's other missteps in claiming age and rank, these criticisms together frame Byron as a poseur, as someone who is essentially appropriating Scottish culture for literary fame, thereby damaging his public persona and literary appeal.

Brougham's criticism has other, more subtle effects as the savagery of Brougham's review not only undercuts Byron's literary appeal and expression of national identity, but also his masculine identity as he fixates on Byron's protestations of minority and status throughout. Although Byron's title is not directly affected by his age, his reception in respectable social society is dependent upon acting in accordance with those codes of *manly,* i.e. *adult*, behavior. Brougham's harping on Byron's minority is a reductive strategy that relegates him to the position of a child, lacking in authority, status, or ability, and by association, symbolically robs Byron of his title and Englishness,

returning him to the position of "a [poor] little boy who lives at Aberdeen" (Eisler 32). To combine this criticism with Brougham's challenge to Byron's sense of Scottishness, and he creates for Byron a crisis of identity as a whole. This crisis is the impetus for Byron's response in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, as he attempts to assert his masculinity and adulthood through the more aggressive, and English, form of Augustan satire.

We may take it at face value that, once these issues were laid public, Byron took the criticism to heart, as Thomas Medwin records Byron as saying that "My love for [Scotland] was at one time much shaken by the critique in the *Edinburgh Review* on *The Hours of Idleness*, and I transferred a portion of my dislike to the country"[74] (57). On this note, Steier and Bernard Beatty argue that Brougham's argument causes Byron to "rethink his own cultural identity" (Steier 40), yet questions about such cultural identification seem to have already been raised in the very text of *Hours of Idleness*, particularly in the revisions to the second edition, which were already in progress throughout late 1807 and early 1808. Among these revisions are the inclusion of the new poems "Stanzas – I would I were a careless child" and "Song," which McGann dates to late 1807 or early 1808,[75] but which were completed before the appearance of Brougham's article.[76] In these poems, Byron continues to highlight his personal experiences as he had done in "Lachin y Gair," but to a much greater extent, leaving off any discussion of Scottish culture or traditions in favor of subjective experience. He begins the poem "Song" with the phrase "When I roved a young

[74] The remainder of the statement concludes "but my affection for it soon flowed back into its old channel." However, Bernard Beatty argues that Byron's use of "soon" is up for debate considering Byron's first public, literary acknowledgement of his Scottish heritage occurs in 1822 in the English Cantos of *Don Juan*.
[75] These poems were intended to replace the longer work, "Childish Recollections," which Byron removed after he had reconciled with Dr. Butler, who he satirizes as "Pomposus" in the poem. (McGann 382).
[76] Marchand's edition of Byron's *Letters and Journals* record the insertion of "Stanzas" in place of "Childish Recollections" in a letter to Byron's publisher, John Ridge on February 16, 1808. Byron's letter to Rev. John Becher on February 26 indicates that he had not yet seen the January number of the *Edinburgh Review*, although he was aware that criticism was forthcoming.

Highlander" (1), establishing a verbal connection between his youth and the Scottish landscape in the first and second stanzas as the speaker "roves" over the "dark heath" (1), climbs the summit of Morven (2), stands on the "crag-cover'd wild" (12) and "bounds" "from mountain to mountain" (18). Yet in the opening line, he definitively identifies himself as a Highlander rather than making a mere comparison with the word "as." His connection to the landscape of Scotland is strengthened when he compares himself to "the rocks where my infancy grew" (6) and remembers "the scenes which my infancy knew" (30). He twice repeats the word "infancy" in the poem to emphasize his youth and the influence of Scotland during his formative years, which indicates the landscape's role in shaping his sense of self and his intellectual and emotional development. While he praises his youthful attachment to and experiences in the Scottish Highlands, the poem is also marked by a sense of absence and un-belonging, particularly Stanza 4, which begins "I left my bleak home, and my visions are gone, / The mountains are vanish'd, my youth is no more" (25-26). Removed from familiar environs, the speaker becomes despondent and "withered" (27), expressing his discomfort with England and his English sense of identity.

In a similar vein, he opens "Stanzas – I would I were a careless child" with the declaration

> I would I were a careless child,
> Still dwelling in my Highland cave,
> Or roaming through the dusky wild,
> Or bounding o'er the dark-blue wave;
> The cumbrous pomp of Saxon pride
> Accords not with the freeborn soul,
> Which loves the mountain's craggy side
> And seeks the rocks where billows roll. (1-8).

In the first four lines of the stanza, Byron moves through progressively more active verbs, beginning with the passive "dwelling", then "roaming", a word reminiscent of the "wandering" recalled in "Lachin y Gair", and then finally to the active "bounding." The emphasis on motion and activity again creates a sense of dynamic participation in his Scottish heritage, as each verb is specifically tied to an element of the Scottish landscape. In contrast to other poems in the volume, such as "On Leaving Newstead Abbey," in which he embraces his English heritage, in stanza two, Byron refers to his "Saxon" heritage as "cumbrous pomp" – an identity based on spectacle and ceremony (rejected under the codes of masculinity associated with both the Highland warrior and the more English "modest masculinity") and one that is viewed as a burden, a perspective that is directly at odds with the "freeborn" nature he imbibed in his Scottish youth. He also goes as far as to declare "Take back this name of splendid sound" (10), verbally renouncing his title, heritage, and Englishness in favor of Scottish intellectual and emotional independence. The reference to this English heritage as "Saxon" is likewise significant, as Byron's notes to the poem indicate the word's close etymological association with the Gaelic "Sassenage"[77], meaning either an English-speaking Lowlander or an Englishman, both "equally alien" to the Highlanders (Colley 15). Byron's use of this word recalls not only the historical conflicts inherent in the English/Scottish relationship, but also a personal feeling of un-belonging, as he says in line 18 that "The world was ne'er design'ed for me." Significantly, his self-identification expresses a sense of contradictory national identity in that he identifies with the terms "Saxon" and "Sassenage," appellations that identify him as an outsider to the Scottish realm even though he rejects the English in favor of the Scottish, a move that demonstrates a sense of discomfort and un-belonging with both his Scottish and English heritage.

[77] A term more recently popularized as "Sassenach", thanks to the *Outlander* television series based on the books by Diana Garbaldon.

While the connection between childhood and national landscape is strong in these two poems, Byron also establishes a connection between Scotland and the feminine. In this analogy, female figures become representative of Scotland and home as the presence of his beloved signifies belonging and acceptance, whereas her absence represents exile and cultural neglect. In "Song," Byron addresses his nostalgic musings to "Mary,"[78] a pattern played out through the sixth and eighth lines of each stanza, seemingly giving equal nostalgic weight to Mary, the Highlands, and the speaker's youth. The sixth line in stanzas 1, 2, 4, and 6 repeat references to Scotland, while stanzas 3 and 5, the exceptions to the pattern, reference dreams of Mary and women who resemble her, respectively. The eighth line of each stanza addresses Mary directly. Graham describes the work briefly as "a poem regretting lost love and lost landscape" ("Byron and Expatriate Nostalgia" 77), two seemingly separate entities, yet this repeated pattern of references to Mary and the Highlands conflate the two figures in the speaker's memory. After introducing Mary at the end of the first stanza, he declares in the second stanza that his emotion for her:

> […] could not be love, for I knew not the name –
> What passion can dwell in the heart of a child?
> But still I perceive an emotion the same,
> As I felt, when a boy, on the crag-cover'd wild. (9-12).

Thus, through this feeling of emotion, "Mary" becomes a symbolic representation of the Highlands and Scotland, a connection likewise demonstrated in Byron's statement that "I left my bleak home, and my visions are gone; / The mountains are vanish'd, my youth is no more: / As the last of my race, I must wither alone" (25-27). It is only after he laments the loss of the landscape of his childhood that he remembers his "heart, still it lingers with [Mary]" (32), who is, presumably, still in

[78] McGann identifies Byron's cousin and childhood playmate, Mary Duff, as the Mary being addressed.

the Highlands, an assumption he seemingly confirms in the last lines. Even in the fifth and sixth stanzas where he directly recalls Mary's beauty, his memories of the landscape are given this same privileged position. In these lines, the loss of his Scottish home, not the loss of Mary, first triggers the speaker's declarations of being alone, and moreover, the loss of Scotland/Mary, brings about the prophecy of the end of his family line.

In "Stanzas," Byron creates a similar parallel between an unnamed woman and Scotland when he laments

> And Woman! Lovely Woman, thou!
> My hope, my comforter, my all!
> How cold must be my bosom now,
> When e'en thy smiles begin to pall (41-44).

The distance between the speaker and his lover is the same as the distance between the speaker and the Scottish landscape of his youth, placing "Woman" and Scotland in a comparable position, just as Byron had done with "Mary" and Scotland in "Song." Yet the differences in epithet are likewise significant. In "Song," Byron addresses a specific person from his past who becomes symbolic of Scotland through his absence from and desire for both. However, in "Stanzas," the last poem to be submitted for insertion in *Hours of Idleness*, the woman is significantly unnamed, but also capitalized, a rhetorical choice that simultaneously suggests "Woman's" importance as well as her universality. This universality, combined with the similarities in structure between "Stanzas" and "Song," suggests that the "Woman" addressed is a feminine representation of Scotland as a whole, and that her loss, or the loss of his sense of Scottishness will lead to a "cold" and comfortless life in England. Yet the romantic relationship suggested by personifying Scotland as a woman contrasts sharply with Byron's dis-ease and feeling of un-belonging also expressed in the poems.

Exclusion from Scotland or isolation from his lover results in a sterile, barren existence, whereas reunion with both his homeland and his love is suggestive of a fertile, productive relationship as well as comfort and, most importantly, acceptance gained. In other words, returning to woo the Woman is returning to woo Scotland and gain cultural admission, to shed his "Sassenage" persona.

Even though "Song" and "Stanzas" were included in the second edition, and therefore escaped Brougham's wrath, they indicate, from Byron's perspective, the very issues of cultural insecurity and the unstable nature of Byron's sense of national identity that Brougham uncovered in his critique. Wheareas the earlier poems, "Oscar of Alva," "The Death of Calmar and Orla," and "Lachin y Gair," are all imitations of other works and illustrate merely an impersonal and tenuous cultural foothold, "Song" and "Stanzas" privilege personal experience and emotion in ways that give the poems a confessional and more intimate tone. With this in mind, Brougham's review, based only on the shallow cultural understanding exhibited in the earlier works, actually strikes at a particularly distressing vulnerability. As a result, the review becomes emotionally invalidating, and when Byron undertakes *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, rather than subject himself to such questions of national identity again, he appears to relinquish them altogether by turning the Scottish motifs of *Hours of Idleness* into negative imagery meant to degrade and defame Scottish national identity. The feminine imagery of "Song" and "Stanzas" is particularly vulnerable in this reversal, considering the ways in which the "lost love" of the two poems slides into references to prostitution and venereal disease, as well as insinuations of ungentlemanly conduct and inferior displays of masculinity.

English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*: restructuring identity and lashing out*

According to the editorial code espoused by the *Edinburgh Review* of using independent, anonymous contributors (Flynn 44), the review of Byron's work was published anonymously, yet Byron firmly believed the magazine's editor, Francis Jeffrey, was responsible for the critique. As the editor and only known face of the *Review*, Jeffrey provided the most obvious choice of target, yet Byron's certainty in blaming Jeffrey also may have been based on the angle of attacks taken by the review's author, some of which would indicate that Byron was dealing with a Lowland Scot. The attacks on his partiality toward Macpherson and Highland ancestry would have been the most obvious clues, as well as the attacks on his title and English education (Steier 39). Both Jeffrey and Brougham were "Borderers," born in Edinburgh, but at the time *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* was initially published, Byron believed that Brougham hailed from more northern parts of Scotland, as Steier points out that Byron's edited notes to *EBSR* indicate disappointment at discovering Brougham's Lowland origins: "Mr. Brougham is not a Pict,[79] as I supposed, but a Borderer, and his name is pronounced Broom, from Trent to Tay.—So be it." (Byron, qtd in Steier 39). Steier assesses Byron's comment as evidence of his "Highlander's bias" as well as a heightened sensitivity to dialect after the criticisms levelled at him in the *Edinburgh Review*. However, Steier neglects to examine the ways in which this bias colors Byron's views of Scottishness. On the surface, Byron's reference to "Picts" alludes to the ways in which eighteenth-century antiquarianism had established the Picts as the ancestors of modern-day Highlanders, and such an identity would likely have marked

[79] Byron's reference here to a "Pict" appears to be a general way of referencing inhabitants of northern Scotland, i.e. Highlanders, as the Picts were a pre-Roman tribe with Celtic origins who occupied the northern-most parts of Great Britain. The Picts experienced less exposure to the Romans than did the more southern inhabitants of present-day Scotland, the Welsh-speaking Britons, creating the roots of the later cultural divide between Highlanders and Lowlanders (Webb 12-13). Colin Kidd credits eighteenth-century antiquarianism, and in particular Macpherson's *Ossian*, for reviving interest in the Picts as part of the debate over the racial and ethnographic origins of the Scottish people (*British Identities Before Nationalism*, 200-204).

Brougham, in Byron's eyes, as an authentic mouthpiece of Scottish culture. Instead, Byron's comment further identifies Brougham as a "Borderer," emphasizing not the geographic location of Brougham's birth, but the fact that, by "bordering" England, Brougham and other Lowlanders were effectively more English than Scottish. In this sense, Byron's comment on Brougham becomes an issue of who is the true Scotsman, even as Byron critiques the culture with which he partially identifies. Despite the anti-Scottish bent of *EBSR*, Byron's remarks indicate that Brougham's mistaken identity as a northerner may have initially softened Byron's verbal blows, so that the bulk of his wrath is projected on Francis Jeffrey, the known Borderer, while Brougham receives only a single, brief mention.

The first edition of *EBSR* appeared anonymously in March 1809. The text of the poem attacks contemporary poets such as Coleridge, Wordsworth, Southey, Scott, and Thomas Moore, among others, for failing to uphold the standards of classical literature handed down through Augustan masters such as Dryden and Pope. In the poem, he also attacks reviewers such as Francis Jeffrey and William Lamb for what he perceives as pandering to literary fashion rather than upholding and encouraging the production of quality verse that he feels would have been produced through the more gentlemanly Augustan tradition. Byron himself models this philosophy by adopting the heroic couplet, a verse form popular among the Augustan poets and utilized in the satiric models consulted for the poem's advent, Pope's *Dunciad* and William Gifford's *Epistle to Peter Pindar* (Marchand 159). Byron's first edition[80] began with the lines:

> Time was, ere yet in these degenerate days
> Ignoble themes obtained mistaken praise
> When Sense and Wit with Poesy allied

[80] As McGann notes, the first edition of *EBSR* began at line 103 in the text of subsequent editions. (*CPW* 1: 397).

No fabled Graces, flourished side by side.

[…]

Then, in this happy Isle, a POPE's pure strain

Sought the rapt soul to charm, nor sought in vain;

A polished nation's praise aspired to claim,

And rais'd the people's as the poet's fame.

Like him great DRYDEN poured forth the tide of song,

In stream less smooth indeed, yet doubly strong.

Then CONGREVE's scenes could cheer, or OTWAY's melt;

For Nature then an English audience felt -- (103-116)

Byron's opening lines employ a standard tactic of satire, namely the nostalgic longing for past glory (be it moral, militaristic, or in this case literary) while noting the perceived degeneration of the current poetic generation, both in style and intellectual substance. In this opening, however, Byron also stresses the overwhelming Englishness of the literary marketplace, an emphasis that, when considered in connection with the theme of degeneration, is suggestive of the erosive influence of non-English authors (and critics). He accomplishes this first by establishing a connection between nationalism and poetics in the phrases "polished nation" and "poet's fame", an association in which the manners and morals of the nation are reflected in the quality of its literary output. The phrases also allude to the function of the Bard as the voice of the nation, which is suggested by the "English Bards" of the title. Significantly, the poets and playwrights referenced (Pope, Dryden, Congreve, and Otway) as superior models are of *English*, not merely *British* nationality, by virtue of being English-born as well as being born before the term "British" came into common usage after the various Acts

of Union[81]. He likewise points out the dominantly English audience, while also referencing the neo-classical concept of "Nature"[82] as it was expressed by Augustan satirists such as Pope in order to invoke a legacy of classicism handed down through education at elite universities. While the reference suggests that such characteristics as quality of thought, feeling, and taste are universally present within an educated English audience, it also implies that they are lacking in a wider national readership that includes the more provincial audience as well as the Scottish and Irish. His complaint that "no dearth of Bards can be complained of now" (124) indicates the ways in which, according to Byron, the literary marketplace has been inundated by inferior poets, the "Feebler Bards" (118) chasing the newest social and literary fads that "make the vulgar stare" (133), a complaint that underscores an elitist view of literature as belonging to the classically educated, and by extension, the gentry or aristocratic classes who were typically able to avail themselves of such an education.

Byron applies these criticisms to contemporary poets throughout the first half of the text, likewise reflecting this nationalistic view of poetic authorship and "Bardism", as his remarks frequently allude not only to the author's skill, education and status, but also to the author's nationality. However, Scottish poets suffer particular criticisms that follow the perpetuation of the Scottish and Highland stereotypes noted by Steier. The first extended personal attack of the poem is directed at Walter Scott, author of *Marmion* and *Lay of the Last Minstrel*, both of which, like his *Waverly* novels, are set in the Scottish Highlands. Byron denounces Scott's poetic skill by referring to his "immeasurable measures" (149) and condemns his content as "Dullness" (151), yet he also

[81] The term "British" was adopted by Scottish citizens after the 1707 Act of Union as a way of identifying themselves as part of the new political unit. (Colley 41-42).
[82] Arthur O. Lovejoy defined this in his 1927 article, "'Nature' as Aesthetic Norm" as "The universal and immutable in thought, feeling and taste; what has always been known, what everyone can immediately understand and enjoy."

criticizes the poems on moral grounds, claiming first that "high-born ladies…fight with honest men to shield a knave" (161-164) and that the hero of Marmion is "Not quite a Felon, yet but half a Knight" (168). Yet, Byron's moral objections extend to Scott personally, as he accuses Scott of publishing for profit, a motivation that would label Scott as a lower-class literary hack:

> And think'st thou, Scott! By vain conceit perchance,
> On public taste to foist thy stale romance,
> Though MURRAY with his MILLER may combine
> To yield thy muse just half-a-crown per line?
> No! when the sons of song descend to trade,
> Their bays are sear, their former laurels fade.
> Let such forego the poet's sacred name,
> Who rack their brains for lucre, not for fame.
> Still for stern Mammon may they toil in vain!
> And sadly gaze on Gold they cannot gain!
> Such be their meed, such still the just reward
> Of prostituted Muse, and hireling bard!
> For this we spurn Apollo's venal son,
> And big a long "good night to Marmion" (171-184).

In this passage, Byron overwhelmingly emphasizes the commercial aspects of publishing. He first names *Marmion*'s publishers, Murray and Miller, two of the London market's prominent booksellers and their proposed payment for the work. The price of "just" a half-a-crown per line suggests the cheapness (and by implication the inferiority) of the work, as well as implying the work's material value depended not on the quality, but on the length. He repeats this charge when

he claims poets in general "rack their brains for lucre, not for fame," a practice that results in a "prostituted Muse and hireling bard". These accusations of profiteering echo eighteenth-century views of for-profit writers as hacks and mental prostitutes, views that tended to exclude professional writers from respectable social circles because of their ungentlemanly profession. This attitude may also explain Byron's insistence on framing himself as a young, amateur writer in the Preface to *Hours of Idleness* as an attempt to distance himself from the stigma of a professional writer. Byron clearly draws a line between the lauded poets of the previous century and the "mercenary poet" inspired by the current upsurge in the literary marketplace when he says that "the sons of song descends to trade."

Byron neglects overt mention of Scott's nationality in his satire, possibly because such mentions are unnecessary. Scott's nationality was well-known and becomes obvious throughout Byron's references to the "Border-nobles," "mountain spirits," and "river sprites," common motifs in both Highland folklore and the romanticized historiography of the Scottish past, elements that Byron himself had utilized and for which he had been criticized in *Hours of Idleness*. However, Byron's remark that "These are the themes, that claim our plaudits now" (185) indicates that Scott and his works are primary examples of the problems plaguing literature in general. In his satiric remarks on other poets, he continues to condemn authors such as Robert Southey, Wordsworth, and Coleridge, on the grounds of style, talent, and intellectual content, yet he deliberately draws attention to the nationality of non-English poets such as Thomas Moore (Irish), Percy Smythe, the 6th Viscount Strangford (Anglo-Irish), and "Amos" Cottle[83] (Welsh), while also repeating many of the same charges of immorality and profiteering he had directed at Walter Scott. Moore and Strangford

[83] Byron gives the name "Amos" Cottle in his text, but the intended victim was actually Amos Cottle's brother, Joseph. Byron himself expresses his confusion in the notes to line 406. *CPW*

are grouped together both by nationality and literary offences, as both are accused of immorality (lines 288, 290, 305), although Byron's criticism here, especially his criticism of Moore, is relatively light compared to his mockery of other poets. As in his criticism of Scott, Byron only indirectly mentions Moore's nationality and instead uses the image of the "wild Lyre" (286), an instrument similar to the harp, a standard symbol of Irish nationality, since Moore's fame as the author of *Irish Melodies* made a direct reference unnecessary.

He compares Moore to the Latin poet Catullus, a reference indicative of the "immoral" nature of Moore's poetry, yet within the larger context of Byron's poem, the comparison to such a classical poet actually becomes covert praise, in spite of Catullus's reputation as an explicit writer, since Byron's overall theme is the superiority of Augustan poetics and its roots in classical Latin and Greek literature. In fact, Byron's comment that "Griev'd to condemn, the Muse must still be just" (289), suggests that Byron's criticism of Moore is actually forced, particularly since the passage ends with the gentle expiation to "mend thy line and sin no more" (294). Byron's vacillating attitude suggests that his condemnation of Moore is for the sake of thematic inclusion as opposed to genuine criticism. Strangford, by contrast, Byron mentions directly as Hibernian and stereotypically red-haired (297-298). He then proceeds to critique Strangford on grounds of style as well as content, cautions him to "mend thy morals and thy taste" (305), accuses him of using a "pilfer'd harp" (307), and ends by admonishing him to not "copy Moore" (308), all criticisms that label Strangford as an inferior poet to Moore. This inferiority becomes even clearer when Strangford's "pilfer'd harp" is contrasted with Moore's "wild Lyre." Although the lyre resembles the Irish harp and Irish nationality, the lyre itself stands as a symbol of classical poetry, being an instrument in use since Greek antiquity. Its prominence or superiority over the harp is also suggested by Byron's capitalization of the word as opposed to the lowercase "harp." In addition, Strangford's harp is also

"pilfer'd," a contrast that portrays Strangford's Irishness as false, similar to the ways in which Byron had been accused of appropriating Scottish culture by Brougham's review. Although Strangford was a member of the Irish peerage and had graduated from Trinity College, Dublin only a few years after Moore, Strangford was in fact London born. Thus, Byron's description of the harp as "pilfer'd" recalls the absentee landlordism common to much of the Irish aristocracy, who were in fact more English than Irish by reason of residence as well as political and social status.

Neither poet, however, is accused of profiteering, as Scott had been, whereas in lines added to the second edition, publishing for profit becomes Byron's chief complaint against Amos and Joseph Cottle, two brothers from Wales. Although Byron names Amos Cottle in the text of the poem, his notes to the passage indicate some confusion as to which brother he was actually attacking. Amos, the translator of a volume of Icelandic poetry published in 1797, had in fact died in September 1800, whereas his younger brother, Joseph, had become a bookseller and a supporter of the Lake poets (Robert Southey in particular), then had retired from bookselling in 1799 in order to start producing his own literary works, such as "Malvern Hills" (1798), "John the Baptist, a Poem" (1801), and "Alfred, an Epic Poem" (1801) (*Dictionary of National Biography*). Beginning at line 385, Byron critiques the brothers, specifically modeling his verse on the style of call used by street vendors to sell goods:

> Boeotian Cottle, rich Bristowa's boast,
> Imports old stories from the Cambrian coast,
> And sends his goods to market – all alive!
> Lines forty-thousand, Cantos twenty-five!
> Fresh fish from Hippocrene! Who'll buy? Who'll buy?
> The precious bargain's cheap—in faith, not I. (387-391)

The style of the verse itself capitalizes on the commercial aspect of writing for pay by framing poetry as any other saleable good, particularly as their verses are "imported" from Wales, a remark that serves to draw attention to the "foreign" or non-English origin of the poetry. The corrupting influence of this importation is also suggested by the comparison to fish, a perishable commodity notorious for its foul smell and dirty nature. Yet the comparison of bookselling to fish mongering also effectively robs the profession of any respectability, a motif repeated throughout the passage and elsewhere in the poem. Just as Scott's writing for pay created a "prostituted muse and hireling bard," Byron accuses the Cottle brothers of producing "prostituted reams" (404) and a "pen perverted" (405). The emphasis on the number of lines and cantos, like his criticism of Scott, also helps to cheapen the work as it again implies that length, not quality, determines the commercial value of the piece independently of its literary merit. Cottle's lack of success as an author *and* a bookseller only serves to heighten Byron's contempt, as the text and his notes coldly point out the lack of financial success as an author compared to his previous work as a bookseller. Byron remarks that Cottle is "Condemned to make the books which once he sold" (398), while in his notes he describes him as "Mr. Cottle, Amos, or Joseph, I don't know which, but one or both, once sellers of books they did not write, and now writers of books that do not sell" (406n). Byron uses this ironic description to suggest Cottle's fall in fortune is a direct result of breaching the boundaries of authorship, both geographically and socially/financially. This breach occurs geographically, as suggested by the "imported" nature of the works, while the social and financial violation of boundaries occurs through the shift in profession from seller to producer. He says that:

> Had Cottle still adorned the counter's side,
>
> Bent o'er the desk, or born to useful toils,
>
> Been taught to make the paper which he soils,

[…]

He had not sung of Wales nor I of him (406-410).

In these lines, Byron's criticism appears to grant more respectability to the manual labor associated with papermaking and bookselling when contrasted with Cottle reaching "above his station" in an attempt to become an author. Additionally, the final, dismissive line that "He had not sung of Wales nor I of him" again emphasizes the imported, and supposedly foreign, character of Cottle's work and its corruption on the literary marketplace. Byron's contempt for the trade author is again exemplified in his confusion of Joseph and Amos Cottle. While certain other errors[84] could be attributed to the rushed nature of publication, Byron seeks to correct these errors in subsequent editions or in his marginalia; however, the lines criticizing the Cottle brothers were inserted in the second edition, thus Byron would have had the opportunity to clarify which brother he is attacking. His failure to correct the name, or to even apparently seek out a clarification, indicates his overall contempt for "trade" authors, who are all one in the same where Byron is concerned.

While the first half of the poem focuses on various poets of the day[85], a disproportionately large portion of the remainder of the satire is focused on literary critics, although Byron's use of the

[84] For example, the pronunciation of Brougham's name, or, in this specific passage, his correction of "Helicon" (a mountain) in the first edition to "Hippocrene" in subsequent editions. (Watson, "Byron's Marginalia to *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*", *Byron Journal*, 37.2, 2009).

[85] Byron also mentions the poets James Graham and Matthew "Monk" Lewis, individuals who, at first glance, might seem to disprove the theory that Byron reserves criticisms of immorality for non-English poets. Graham, a Scottish poet, is criticizes mostly on grounds of style and content, with Byron criticizing the dull, depressing nature of his religious-themed poetry and his "mangled prose" (322). Yet Byron finishes his criticism of Graham by asserting that the style of his poetry "boldly pilfers from the Pentateuch" (324) and "Perverts the prophets, and purloins the Psalms" (326), essentially accusing him of blasphemy as well as unoriginality. Lewis, an English author, on the other hand, is accused of immorality as Byron essentially repeats previous criticism of the immorality of his Gothic works such as *The Monk* (1796). Lewis's nationality would seem to defy the theory that Byron reserves moral criticism for foreign authors, however, Lewis was actually born in Jamaica to English parents. Byron's accusations of immorality directed at Lewis in fact mirror, although to a much lesser degree, accusations leveled at John Wolcott (alias, Peter Pindar) in Gifford's satire *Epistle to Peter Pindar* (1800), which Byron had consulted as one of the models for *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*.

plural is misleading. His main targets are the editors of the *Edinburgh Review*,[86] more specifically Francis Jeffrey, who is satirized at greater length than any other single personage throughout the poem, with a 121-line attack in the first edition, as well as lines added to the second edition, such as the new beginning (lines 1-96) and the added postscript. This emphasis suggests that his real target is actually the reviewers and that his criticism of contemporary poets is, for the most part, of secondary concern to retaliating against the reviewers responsible for savaging *Hours of Idleness*, especially considering the lack of vigor in some other criticisms (Moore, for example). The inclusion of such a subsidiary argument may be explained as a matter of satiric convention, as well as the lingering text of the poem's first iteration, *British Bards*, a lighter Horatian satire that had been targeted solely at authors of the new mode. The augmented title as well as content suggests Byron's redirected wrath toward the reviewers in the light of their criticism of *Hours of Idleness*, however, as Steier points out, "The new title and direction for the poem represented a cultural as well as a personal renegotiation for Byron, who would use *EBSR* to question his Scottish roots rather than romanticize his memories of the Highland regions where in his youth he once 'rove[d] a careless mountaineer'" (38). Indeed, Byron's refashioned title highlights the cultural, social, and political divisions between England and Scotland, rather than the unified front imagined in the word "British". However, Byron's condemnation of the literary reviewers takes on a different theme than his criticism of contemporary poets. Whereas in the text of the poem, Byron primarily disparages fellow authors based on intellectual, stylistic, and moral grounds, his Preface broaches issues of gender and negative feminine imagery, which he applies only in broad sweeps to the authors being critiqued. This imagery, however, becomes a more noticeable thematic complaint in his

[86] McGann's notes indicate that original drafts of Byron's manuscript included an "argument," later deleted, which either heavily suggests or clearly remarks that this was Byron's intent. (103n.401).

denunciation of Francis Jeffrey and the critics of the *Edinburgh Review* as he tends to portray Scotland and Scottish influence in terms of negative feminine imagery throughout the poem, in contrast to the positive femininity of belonging found in *Hours of Idleness* and the poem "Song."

He first employs this negative feminine imagery in the final paragraph of the Preface when he compares the authors he attacks to "mental prostitutes," which demotes the targeted authors and critics to a position of the most disreputable women. This insult by itself is a common slur wielded against professional authors since the previous century, and one that Byron repeated in criticisms of Scott and Cottle, yet the way in which Byron pairs this slur with a medical analogy is worth noting. In this analogy, Byron elevates himself to a position of authority, that of a "doctor" set on curing the ills of the literary realm:

> …in the absence of the regular physician, a country practitioner, may in cases of absolute necessity, be allowed to prescribe his nostrum to prevent the extension of so deplorable an epidemic, provided there be no quackery in his treatment of the malady. A caustic is here offered as it is to be feared nothing short of actual cautery can recover the numerous patients afflicted with the present prevalent and distressing *rabies* for rhyming. – As to the *Edinburgh Reviewers*; it would, indeed, require a Hercules to crush the Hydra; but if the Author succeeds in merely 'bruising one of the heads of the serpent', though his own hand should suffer in the encounter, he will be amply satisfied. (32-49)

While McGann notes that certain "traces of this topos can be found in "British Bards," […] it did not begin to get exploited until B[yron] was preparing his poem for publication. He self-consciously invoked it in his prose preface only after all the textual revisions for the first edition had been made" (*CPW* 399). One reason for this increased attention on the metaphor of disease in the

Preface may be due to the influence of *The Scotiad* (1809), a satiric poem published under the pen name "Macro." David Radcliffe dates the poem, which mocks the Scottish Enlightenment in general and the *Edinburgh Review* specifically, to roughly January or February 1809,[87] the same time that Byron would have been composing lines 438-527 on Francis Jeffrey (McGann, *CPW* 397). In the *Scotiad*, the Scottish Enlightenment is referred to as "The Itch" and the "Scotch Fiddle," both terms used as euphemisms for syphilis. Although in the Preface, Byron compares the growing popularity of the new poetry to "rabies", an insult that fittingly encompasses what he perceives as the uncontrolled affinity for and stupidity of the new poetic fad, the passage is more likely a subtle reference to either syphilis or gonorrhea, an analogy that further emphasizes the morally deviant and infectious nature of the new poetic style. Such a deliberate mis-naming of the disease can be attributed to the falling popularity of allusions to venereal disease in satire, a change initiated during the Restoration and 18th century (Guilhamet 199), yet several clues within the passage reveal Byron's actual referent. His description of the new style of poetry as an "epidemic" encompasses the widespread nature of venereal disease in early-nineteenth century England, while his naming of "rabies" is suggestive of the dementia associated with the tertiary stage of syphilis. Additionally, he describes his attack as the use of "caustics" as a cure, one of the typical remedies used to treat syphilitic chancres (Merians 8), and nowhere associated with actual rabies.[88]

[87] Radcliffe dates the poem according to the dates of two Peninsular War battles and the publication of the first number of Walter Scott's new review.

[88] Byron's dog, Botswain, experienced a type of fit in November 1808 (just two months before writing the lines on Jeffrey in *EBSR*) and soon died. The symptoms, as Fiona MacCarthy assert, follow the general progression of canine rabies, including seizures and heavy drooling or foaming at the mouth (78-79) and have long been recognized as such. Although Thomas Moore claimed Byron was ignorant enough of rabies to care for the dog himself, Eisler stresses that "Given his familiarity with dogs, however, Byron's behavior reveals not ignorance, but his refusal to acknowledge the death throes of the stricken animal" (160). Given Eisler's assertion, it is reasonable to assume that Byron was familiar enough with the disease to not mistake or confuse the details in *EBSR*, and would not have made such a mistake again after being called out for misinformation ("pibroch"/bagpipe) in *Hours*.

While the initial implications of this analogy between the new poetic style and venereal disease suggest the corrupting and immoral aspects of the new poetry, Byron's comparison to venereal disease also emphasizes the perceived feminine nature of the new poetry. Contemporary medical knowledge of the pathology of venereal disease considered the female to be the source of infection, most specifically the prostitute who became the symbol for "deviancy and excess" (Spongberg 6), and whose body came to be regarded as not only an "agent of transmission but [also] as inherently diseased, if not the disease itself" (Spongberg 6). This view of disease plays out in Byron's contempt for the poets (as demonstrated by the personal attacks on morality and honor) as well as their works. Thus, through this analogy, Byron creates a marked contrast between the new schools of poetry and the Augustan standards that he upholds. The popular poets Byron attacks in the main body of the work become feminized through the references to "mental prostitution" as well as the diseases associated with such women, while the new style of poetry, likewise, is associated with excess and moral degeneracy. By implication, the Augustan, classical tradition, and in particular Augustan satire, is the masculine counterpart, particularly as the style of satire is aggressive and confrontational, while its purpose remains to preserve the poetic as well as moral standards of literature.

Additionally, Byron's interpretation of these standards would seem to exclude the corruption of foreign influence, an issue firmly demonstrated in his critique of Amos and Joseph Cottle. This theme presents itself through Byron's metaphor in the xenophobic roots of syphilitic infections, since, in addition to the disease's alleged origins in Central America, newly infected countries across Europe had been known to attribute syphilis to the nearest (hated) neighbor (Spongberg 4). Reactions to the disease commonly included policies of exclusion, as early sufferers were forced into exile (Spongberg 4), a strategy that was repeated later as hospitals routinely

separated venereal disease patients from others for fear of spreading their moral corruption as well as the disease (Brown 58-61). Byron's satire functions in such a way that it isolates the writers suffering from the "rabies for rhyming" from the remainder of the literary population. Yet his criticism also separates the immoral writers from the merely stylistically and intellectually inferior, a division that happens to occur almost exclusively along nationalistic as well as stylistic lines, as seen in the different criteria for attack applied to English and non-English poets in the body of the poem.

At the end of the first paragraph, however, Byron shifts from this medical analogy to mythology, as well as from poets to reviewers while asserting his own literary dominance. He claims that eradicating the *Edinburgh Review* would require a "Hercules to fight the Hydra," the hero from Greek myth who projects an image of strength, power, masculinity, and virility and the many-headed monster Hercules killed as one of the Twelve Labors imposed by King Eurystheus.[89] Even though Byron shifts between metaphor and myth, he creates a parallel between the position of "doctor," which he assumes for himself, and the role of the Hercules. This juxtaposition lends Byron's doctor persona the same sense of masculinity and healthful virility that is lacking in the doctor's "patients," despite his hollow protestations of inadequacy in these rolls. Byron's additions to the Preface included with the second edition, assert that "My object is not to prove that I can write well, but, *if possible*, to make others write better" (11-13). This avowal, however, is belied by the fact that he first affirms his decision to publish the second edition with his name and then expounds on the literary success of the first edition, both factors that draw attention to his authorship. Byron then takes steps to bolster his own poetic authority by framing himself as the

[89] Feminine imagery is likewise strong in the mythology of Hercules and the Hydra, as King Eurystheus was allied to Hera while the Hydra was her creation. Furthermore, Hercules battled against feminine influence in other mythological tales, including his enslavement by the nymph Omphale, a story that revolves around a theme of gender reversal as it is Hercules who is forced to cross-dress and perform womanly tasks, such as weaving. Together, these associations suggest Hercules as a hero battling against the superiority of the female influence.

voice of classical poetry in the absence (or apparent silence) of William Gifford, the poet known for his scathing attack on and dismantling of the Della Cruscan movement of the previous generation. The overall tone of the preface is in keeping with the general character of Juvenalian satire, which is best described as aggressive and confrontational, qualities typically ascribed to masculine behavior.

In the new opening lines of the poem, he begins a more obvious assertion of his own literary and masculine authority that includes distancing himself from his previous work, *Hours of Idleness*, and the criticisms of immaturity and lack of authority it had received. He first repeats the defiant tone of the preface when he declares that he will publish even though "Scotch Reviews / Should dub me scribbler, and denounce my Muse" (3-4), a direct challenge issued to the contributors of the *Edinburgh Review* where the most severe review had originated. Furthermore, his apostrophe to his "grey goose-quill" beginning at line 7 asserts his literary as well as masculine authority through the pen's "slavery" (8) and "obedience" (8), as a "mighty instrument of little men!" (9), which symbolizes and affirms his masculine authority through its phallic imagery, where the "might" of the male writer is transferred to the "instrument" he uses. Byron then declares

> I, too, can scrawl, and once upon a time
> I poured forth along the town a flood of rhyme,
> A school-boy freak, unworthy praise or blame;
> I printed—older children do the same. (47-50)

The emphatic use of the past tense in this section combined with the phrase "once upon a time" emphasizes the past nature of the criticized work, while the phrases "school-boy freak" and "older children" reference the work's impulsive and juvenile nature, and by implication, the lack of mature masculine expression. By extension, he also ascribes such literary and intellectual immaturity to those poets who continue to publish in this vein, effectively emasculating his competition, while

implying that he has moved safely beyond this genre into adulthood, physically and intellectually. Significantly, Byron only recalls selective criticisms of *Hours of Idleness* and avoids the references to his Scottish heritage that had drawn so much ire in Brougham's review. Such an omission is telling, considering that he closes the stanza by referencing Francis Jeffrey and brothers William and George Lamb,[90] Scottish and Anglo-Irish respectively. Yet Byron also chooses to criticize the reviewers on literary grounds rather than nationalistic. Jeffrey, specifically, he calls a "self-constituted Judge of poesy" (62). Byron's insult undermines Jeffrey's authority as a literary critic by implying that he has unjustly assumed authority by entering the literary profession through an inferior genre (in contrast to Byron's self-imposed authority assumed through his training in and adherence to the classical tradition). Yet, such an insult, in close proximity to the references to immaturity, also suggests that Jeffrey in particular is a young upstart (despite being several years older than Byron) who is unable to engage with poets writing in a more assertive and authoritative style. By avoiding issues of nationality in this particular section, Byron's text suggests an attempt to distance himself from his Scottish heritage and its implied juvenility and lack of masculine expression, just as he attempts to distance himself from his juvenile poetry that contained references to Scotland, an important distinction given the nationalistic boundaries he will draw in his criticism of Jeffrey starting at line 418.

Meanwhile, Byron continues to challenge the masculinity of his targets, particularly Jeffrey. After declaring Jeffrey a "Self-constituted Judge of Poesy", he continues the next stanza by proclaiming:

> A *man* must serve his time to every trade

[90] The Lamb brothers were British born but heirs to an Irish Peerage. William Lamb later became the 2nd Viscount Melbourne in 1828.

Save Censure; Critics all are ready made.

Take hackneyed jokes from MILLER, got by rote,

With just enough of learning to misquote;

. . . . . .

To JEFFREY go, be silent and discreet,

His pay is just ten sterling pounds per sheet:

Fear not to lie, 'twill seem a sharper hit,

Shrink not from blasphemy, 'twill pass for wit (63-71, emphasis mine).

Byron begins the passage with the words "A man," a significant choice of words that brings issues of manliness and gentlemanly conduct, particularly as they relate to concepts of morality, to the forefront in the passage. He starts by emphasizing that a "man" must earn his expertise in "every trade / Save Censure", a remark that suggests a paradigm in which masculinity is defined, at least in part, by occupational preparedness. The paradigm, as well as the enjambment of the lines, sets the role of the critic in general at odds with other respectable occupations by implying that critics exhibit a different, inferior definition of masculine behavior because of this lack of preparation as compared with other professions. That the critics have attempted to circumvent this requirement for apprenticeship to the literary trade demonstrates the ways in which Byron thinks critics have violated the traditional social and professional order so that they might usurp authority. Repetitions of Jeffrey's name in this stanza and the next, however, focus this particular criticism on the contributors of the *Edinburgh Review*. The stanza ends with accusations of lying and blasphemy, immoral actions considered a breach of gentlemanly behavior and acceptable social standards, which also accentuates the social and intellectual inferiority of critics as well as their immoral influence in the literary marketplace. This theme is continued into the next stanza when Byron

again places the critics in a de-masculinized position when he says that readers would be better off to "Believe a woman or an epitaph, / or any other thing that's false, before / You trust in Critics who themselves are sore" (78-80). The misogyny evident in the lines compounds the insult, since the critics are relegated to a position lower than that of an inconstant or "false" woman, again insinuating inferiority as well as moral corruption. By comparing the editors to women, Byron further erodes their literary authority by placing the editors in a subservient position, mirroring the ways in which Scotland is subservient to the authority of England as the political and cultural powerhouse of Great Britain.

Together, these stanzas suggest that the critics of the *Edinburgh Review* (and by extension, critics and writers operating in the same literary vein) exhibit elements of a corrupted or inferior form of masculinity that is damaging to the literary marketplace, particularly as it undermines the typically masculine authority of the Augustan, classical tradition. This theme is most evident, and most viciously applied, in Byron's critique of Francis Jeffrey, starting at line 418. He warms to his topic in non-gendered terms first by mentioning the "northern blast" (421), "Caledonian gales" (422) and "Northern wolves" (429), references to Scotland and the *Edinburgh Review*. This imagery is contrasted with his references to James Montgomery[91], author of *The Wanderer of Switzerland* (1806), as the Greek poet Alcaeus, again suggesting the reviewer's destructive influence on the classical tradition. He furthermore emphasizes the critics' immoral behavior as "cowards" (430) with "brutal instinct" (431) and "no mercy" (433), further attacks on their adherence to proper codes of gentlemanly behavior. In the next stanza, Byron makes an extended comparison between Jeffrey and the seventeenth-century judge, George Jefferies, notorious for his severity and bias,

[91] Montgomery was Scottish born, but had significant ties to the Yorkshire region of England.

before launching into a satiric retelling of the infamous duel between Jeffrey and Thomas Moore.[92] It is in this account that Byron most obviously attacks the masculinity of his targets, significantly by using some of the same gendered themes as he had used in his own *Hours of Idleness*.

He begins by recalling "That ever glorious, almost fatal fray, / When LITTLE'S leadless pistol met his eye" (465-466). The "leadless pistol" references the fact that when the magistrates interrupted the dueling attempt, in the confusion one of the dueling pistols was found to be unloaded, although it was Jeffrey's pistol, not Moore's. Byron's note on the text includes a comment summarizing the affair, with the added notation that "on examination, the balls of the pistols, were found to have evaporated" (McGann 407, 467n). In Howard Jones's biography of Thomas Moore, he states that the original text of the note also included the phrase "like the courage of the combatants" (141). Together, the satire and the offending note imply a lack of gentlemanly behavior through cowardice as well as sexual impotence and therefore a lack of masculinity. This slur against the manhood of both Moore and Jeffrey is surrounded by imagery in which the landscape of Scotland itself is both sympathetic and feminized. He begins with the "fertile shores of Fife" (461) then describes the landscape's reaction to the danger against Jeffrey:

> On her firm set rock
> Dunedin's castle felt a secret shock;
> Dark roll'd the sympathetic waves of Forth,

[92] Moore challenged Jeffrey after the *Edinburgh Review* published a somewhat defamatory review of Moore's poetic collection, *Epistles, Odes and other Poems* in the July 1806 edition, accusing Moore of perverting his audience with scandalously erotic lyrics. The attempted duel occurred on August 15, 1806 at Chalk Farm, but the Bow Street Police intervened and arrested the participants. After Moore and Jeffrey were released, Jeffrey's pistol was found to be unloaded, a mistake likely caused by the scuffle with police and the seconds' (dueling assistants) lack of experience with pistols. However, Moore was accused of foul play, or at the least, cowardice. The participants issued a "letter of denial" to protect their reputation, but newspaper accounts had already latched onto the detail, embarrassing Moore.

Low groan'd the startled whirlwinds of the North;

Tweed ruffled half his waves to form a tear,

The other half pursued its calm career;

ARTHUR'S steep summit nodded to its base,

The surly Tolboth scarcely kept her place;

The Tolbooth felt—for sometimes marble can,

On such occasions, feel as much as man –

The Tolbooth felt defrauded of his charms,

If JEFFREY died, except within her arms;

Nay, last not least, on that portentous morn

The sixteenth story where himself was born,

His patrimonial garret fell to ground,

And pale Edina shuddered at the sound (468-483).

Throughout the passage, elements of both the manmade and the natural landscape are feminized, particularly Dunedin Castle, the Tolbooth (a prison), and the city itself (Edina, a feminized nickname for Edinburgh). The river Tweed itself is masculine and shows sympathetic emotion, although Byron specifically applies this display of sympathy only to the Scottish side, as he says in his notes that "The Tweed here behaved with proper decorum: it would have been highly reprehensible in the English half of the River to have shown the smallest symptom of apprehension" (McGann 407, 473n). Byron's commentary in the note differentiates nationality not only by geography, but by behavior, again implying that Scottish masculinity performs according to a different paradigm, which is, significantly, blocked or impeded at the English border. The Tolbooth, he implies, reacts in a manner that is particularly, and appropriately feminine, in spite of its function as a prison and

location of several executions,[93] contrasting an overwhelming feminine edifice with a space typically dominated by masculine authority. Significantly, however, this masculine presence is one that is morally corrupt, as seen by the references to criminals and executions.

The tale continues with Byron's introduction of "Caledonia's Goddess" (490), dressed in a kilt (524) as Jeffrey's supernatural savior, yet his mythological creation bears out the theme of misshapen and deviant sexuality first proposed in the Preface. In his notes, Byron refers to the goddess's dress as "short petticoats" (McGann 409, 527n), a description loosely applied to the kilt. Although the kilt is widely associated with Scotland in general, the short kilt described here was typically worn only by Highland warriors while women opted for the arisaid, a full skirted plaid similar to the men's version (MacKinnon, 82-83). The reversal of dress in this instance insinuates a reversal of gendered rolls between the protectorate Goddess and Jeffrey, a suggestion strengthened by the final lines of the next stanza. Byron ends by stating that "Edina", the

> . . .blushing Itch, coy nymph, enamoured grown
> Forsakes the rest and cleaves to thee [Jeffrey] alone
> And, too unjust to other Pictish men,
> Enjoys thy person, and inspires thy pen! (536-539).

The last line of the passage in particular indicates the exchange of sexual favors between Jeffrey and a feminized concept of Scotland, yet this imagery again creates a role reversal by suggesting that it is Scotland who obtains sexual pleasure from Jeffrey, putting Jeffrey in the position of the

[93] Full text of the quote:
"This display of sympathy on the part of the Tolbooth, (the principal prison in Edinburgh) which truly seems to have been most affected on the occasion, is much to be commended. It was to be apprehended, that the many unhappy criminals executed in the front, might have rendered the Edifice more callous. She is said to be of the softer sex, because her delicacy of feeling on this day was truly feminine […]" (McGann 407-408, 479n).

mental prostitute writing for pay. References to the "Itch" recall the rhetoric of venereal disease and prostitution found in the Preface, particularly as "person" and "pen" are linked in a parallel structure within the last line. Just as the infection of venereal disease spreads through the "person", the contagion of foreign literary influence is spread through the "pen". In these metaphors, writing itself becomes sexualized, but at the same time framed as an act vulnerable to deviance and corruption. His earlier declaration from the Caledonian Goddess that Jeffrey would prosper "as long as Albion's heedless sons submit, / Or Scottish taste decides on English wit" (502-503), indicate the ways in which Byron sees such Scottish influence as invasive, foreign, and corrupting.

After dismantling Jeffrey and others throughout the poem, Byron asserts his own Englishness in the final lines of the poem. He distinctly refers to England as "My country" (992) and claims his work as a defense of "her honor" (993), while encouraging English poets to reclaim the classical poetic values set forth by ancient Greek and Roman poets. Sexualized language is absent from these final lines, suggesting a more pure and morally superior relationship between poet and nation when compared with the sexualized view of Scottish literary influence. Furthermore, Byron references "Britain" twice once classical authority has been affirmed, the first time the political structure as a whole, and not its individual parts, has been mentioned throughout the poem. The timing of the reference indicates that the only way in which the nations can be united under one (literary) banner, is under the guiding standards of the classical tradition and the rejection of the individual influences of the nation's subsidiary parts.

Conclusion

Whereas Burns and Moore came from national communities with long-established cultural traditions, Byron is not only caught between two directly competing cultures, but also initially

struggles against outward perceptions and expectations that limit his ability to explore, develop, and express that identity. These internal conflicts are evident in the difference in tone between the original poems of *Hours of Idleness* and the revised poems inserted for the second edition. The poems not only demonstrate Byron's internal sense of Scottishness, but also his inward insecurities regarding place, culture, and belonging. Although they evoke many of the stereotypical and romanticized images of the Scottish Highlands, the later poems, "Song" and "Stanzas -- I would I were a Careless Child," when contrasted with the Scottish poems of the first edition, reveal a sense of "identity in progress" as the Highland images recalled become more personal and intimate, rather than imitational. Byron continues to revisit and refine the Scottish imagery in his poems throughout his career, as Stephen Cheeke declares that Scotland is "constantly recalled by other places, and therefore inescapable and unforgettable" (36), yet he never does so from the first person perspective again until *Don Juan*. Cheeke describes this development as "a pursuit in which the poet makes gestures either of scornful rejection (lighting his pipe [with the *Edinburgh Review*]), or else is suddenly disarmed by moments of nostalgia" (36). One could assume that without the interference of Brougham's critique and the negativity shone on his imperfect Scottish expression, Byron may have continued to revisit and refine his sense of Scottishness throughout his poetic career in a first person and more consistently positive sense. Instead, Brougham's review undermines and dismantles the Scottish identity present in the earlier poems, leaving Byron with only a loosely defined sense of Englishness that is also damaged by Brougham's attacks on his trumpeting of age and status.

English identity, in many cases, is only determined in terms of not being Irish, or not being Scottish, meaning that the answer to "What is it to be English?" is an unstable concept in and of itself. When confronted with his lack of cultural knowledge of Scotland, the land he had praised and

with which he had identified in *Hours of Idleness*, Byron responds with a knee-jerk all-or-nothing response, and rather than admit his lack of cultural knowledge, he internalizes Brougham's criticism and re-dubs himself wholly English in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*. He does this first by adopting the Augustan mode of satire and railing at authors who practice in the newer literary styles. These styles become synonymous with corrupting foreign influence as Byron's comments focus on nationality and origin as well as poetic ability and content. He also redefines himself by opting for the one paradigm that for him seems steadfastly English in nature, the codes of conduct associated with aristocratic male behavior. Byron turns these codes against his targets in order to critique not only their morality, but also their masculinity, as the paradigm of the polite gentleman places an emphasis on moral or upright behavior as well as civility in conduct. While he never overtly accuses any of his targets of insults toward anything but poesy, Byron's attacks on his targets ties their morality to nationality, repeating many of the stereotypes of cultures subservient to England and expressing a type of "literary xenophobia."

Byron's remarks assert his own English and poetic identity as a point of contrast, as his sense of self is defined in opposition to his targets. By critiquing the foreign, he himself is not-foreign; by critiquing the immoral, he himself is moral. In this sense, the absence of a true definition of "What it means to be English?" is irrelevant, so long as the English are superior to their foreign colleagues. The problem with this ideology is that in basing superiority on patterns of behavior, i.e. the gentlemanly code of conduct, behavior can be mimicked and the so-called national boundaries established by such behavior are erased. A case in point is Thomas Moore, who essentially uses the same logic, that of behavior-equals-respectability, to argue that the Irish and Catholic populations are morally, culturally, and nationally equal to the English and deserving of the same rights granted to the English. This point is driven home in the infamous dueling challenge issued to Byron by

Moore, and in its subsequent non-violent resolution, an incident that ultimately led to the two poets' lifelong friendship. Although Byron effectually redeemed his poetic reputation on the Augustan merits of the piece, the overall venom of the satire still demonstrates a noteworthy level of emotional immaturity that Byron came to regret, prompting him to recall and destroy the fifth edition of the poem. Byron apologized to Moore for the slanders on his reputation, just as he would apologize to a great many of the figures he critiqued in *EBSR* in subsequent years. Pointedly, his apology to Jeffrey, the primary individual target of *EBSR* occurs in the same stanzas of *Don Juan* in which Byron publicly acknowledges his Scottish heritage for the first time since *Hours of Idleness*. In these stanzas, Jeffrey, "once [his] most redoubted foe" (Canto X, 122), becomes a fellow countryman and colleague under the banner of "Auld Lang Syne."

Irish Harps, Scottish Fiddles, English Pens: A Conclusion

The title of this study was chosen as a conscious nod to Lord Byron's *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, by borrowing the structure of pairing a representative demonym with a noun. In Byron's case, this noun indicates the professional function of the persons discussed in the poem; however, in the title of this study, the demonyms are paired with objects imbued with national importance. These objects act reductively in a way that addresses the attitudes and assumptions underlying national identity. The "Irish Harp" serves as a positive image, one long recognized as symbolic of the Irish literary tradition and the perseverance of Irish national myth, but more broadly representative of the late eighteenth-century trend toward antiquarianism and the revival of national consciousness. The "Scottish Fiddle," on the other hand, bears a more negative symbolism, as the anonymous poem *The Scotiad*, mentioned in Chapter 3, relates the term "Scotch Fiddle" to cases of venereal disease, a euphemism well-known in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[94] This negative association demonstrates the overall disparagement directed toward the Scottish people in particular and the non-English members of the British state in general. Finally, the "English Pen" suggests the social and cultural dominance of England and the English tradition in the literary marketplace, a symbolic "over-writing" of cultural difference and national tradition with English values and standards.

This study examined the ways in which Robert Burns, Thomas Moore, and George Gordon, Lord Byron, use satire in order to challenge these former notions of cultural identity and the various

[94] References to the "Scotch Fiddle" can be found in the Earl of Rochester's poem, "Tunbridge Wells." Ashley Chantler and Paul Hammond associate the reference with "an itch" meaning sexual desire, or, more significantly, "The Itch," a common euphemism for syphilis. This definition is supported by *Grose's Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* (1823), an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century version of the popular website, *Urban Dictionary*, first published in 1785.

power structures that enforce English dominance. That these authors accomplish this challenge through satire is fitting, as the genre is traditionally marked by expressions of anger, frustration, bitterness, and criticism often directed at political entities, emotions demonstrated in the quotations that begin the introduction. Yet when these satires are used as expressions of national identity, changes take place in both the function of satire and the role of the satirist. Instead of affirming the status quo and arguing against social and cultural change, as most Juvenalian/conservative satire of the period does (Dyer, Grimes), these feelings of anger and frustration targeted at the structures reinforcing English dominance prompt satires that seek to affect change for the betterment of the poets' respective nationalities. The various ways in which this is accomplished, or even the degree of success achieved by each author, varies according to individual combinations of factors, including nationality, education, social status, and language. These characteristics overlap in ways that resemble a Venn diagram of sorts.

Education, Status and Satiric Style

The educational background of each author is the first factor to consider when examining the different outcomes of the satiric efforts of Burns, Moore, and Byron. Whereas Burns was largely self- or privately taught, Moore and Byron were both educated within the university system, a curriculum that privileged standard English and the English literary tradition as a form of communication. This difference explains the stylistic choices made by each author, as Burns avails himself of a longstanding Scottish literary tradition and the use of the *Habbie* stanza as well as the heavy use of Scots dialect. Burns's targets, both internal (the Kirk) and external (the English government) are vulnerable to these attacks, as the use of dialect stands to censure the Kirk from within shared cultural characteristics, while the government is condemned by a supposedly inferior

literary, linguistic, and cultural mode. While Burns's satires against the Kirk are either directly attributed (as in the case of *Holy Fair*) or published privately and anonymously (*The Twa Herds* and *Holy Willie's Prayer*), the use of dialect in the political satires allows for the persona of the "Humble Bardie," a figure with keen perceptions and worldly knowledge, but who English readers could feasibly dismiss on the grounds of his apparent lack of education or sophistication. On the other hand, Moore and Byron write in a primarily Classical satiric mode, one that is heavily informed by the satiric standards of English Augustan poets such as Dryden, Pope, and Churchill. Moore begins his satiric career using the Juvenalian tone of classical satire, as his initial satires condemn the English government and the laws that oppress the Irish population, while incorporating some elements of traditional Irish poetry, such as the *aisling* motif; yet his most significant alterations are the combination of satire with the epistolary poem and the shift to more Horatian or jovial satires, giving rise to a satire that is multi-voiced and more difficult for authorities to target as seditious libel. This multi-voiced narrative allows for the same level of deniability as Burns's ironic "Humble Bardie."

Of the three poets, Byron is the only satirist to maintain an almost wholly Juvenalian tone within his satire; yet, he is also the only satirist to argue essentially in favor of maintaining the status quo, at least in literature. This conservative slant is an established feature of Juvenalian satire found in the poetry of his role models, Churchill and Pope, and a result of the second combination of factors to consider, the combination of socio-economic status and nationality. While Burns and Moore both belonged to nationalities that suffered under the influence of English dominance, Byron claims the dual heritage of being both Scottish and English. Unlike Burns and Moore, this dual heritage, primarily his Englishness, protected Byron somewhat from any social and political backlash that may have arisen from his Scottish heritage. This shielding is augmented by his status as an English aristocrat, a permanent marker not only of social status, but of belonging within the dominant

culture and political entity of Great Britain. His title as an English lord essentially establishes his position as part of the social and political structures against which Burns and Moore struggled. The only time in which Byron's sense of national identity is threatened is in Brougham's review, the consequences of which are primarily literary and professional, and cause for embarrassment, but of little meaningful risk to his wider social and political acceptance, other than temporary embarassment. Byron's response in *EBSR* then, is to affirm the more advantageous English identity and in large part deny his Scottishness, essentially setting up a false dichotomy.

Burns and Moore, on the other hand, both faced the direct consequences of oppression enacted by resident structures of power, whether it be from the local Kirk Session or the central government in London, both negative authoritative structures that threatened the expression of national identity and hindered cultural acceptance within the wider scope of an inclusive sense of Britishness, as opposed to the more limiting and only vaguely defined sense of "Englishness." Burns, as a tenant farmer, and Moore, as the son of a grocer, possessed no such shielding aristocratic status, although Moore's position as a member of the merchant or middle class placed him within the lower ranks of gentility, a position from which social acceptance among the higher strata could be attained more easily. Rather than affirming the cultural and political structures in place, Burns and Moore use their satires to combat these oppressive forces, as Burns attempts to dismantle the more restrictive elements of Auld Licht Calvinism as well as the political regulations and stereotypes limiting Scottish national welfare, and Moore strikes back at the English system's overt efforts to disenfranchise the Irish people through anti-Catholic measures.

Action and the Role of the Bard

For all three poets, assumptions regarding an individual's actions, and how these actions express national identity, provide the foundation for their satiric works. For Burns, these assumptions identify the undesirable characteristics found in Orthodox Calvinism, characteristics expressed in the cruelty and hypocrisy of church members, which are then associated with the negative stereotypes harming the Scottish nation. This association essentially creates an ideology in which Orthodoxy is the scapegoat for Scotland's negative elements, a problem that must be uprooted in order for Scotland to move forward and become an accepted part of the British Union. Burns likewise sheds light on the actions of government ministers to demonstrate the failings of the English government, criticism that tends to undermine the sense of English superiority while pointing out the unfair treatment of the Scottish, in effect leveling the playing field. His persona of the "Humble Bardie," in this sense, outgrows the more traditional view of a bard as an impartial historical observer and instead directly confronts the political actors and constructs that endanger the Scottish nation.

Moore and Byron, on the other hand, focus their attention on the ways in which an individual's actions reflect gentlemanly conduct. Moore takes these standards as the epitome of acceptability, a key for gaining entrance into the ranks of respectable society for himself personally and for the Irish at large. Whereas Burns approaches identity from a prescriptive angle, identifying the undesirable elements of Scottishness and seeking to root them out, Moore approaches Irish identity from the position of an established cultural and social equality that has only to be recognized within the overarching English social framework. His satires, then, work to expose the ways in which the actions of English political figures fail to uphold these gentlemanly values, principles that include a general sense of Christian behavior that, importantly, overrides the

ideological differences between Protestant and Catholic to unite the British empire. In this appeal to Christian values, a point expressed most forcefully in the satire *The Sceptic*, Moore ends the poem with a speaker who is poised for further action while being surrounded by the personified figures of several key virtues. This speaker, like Burns's "Humble Bardie," combines the figure of the bard with the critical voice of the satirist in order to bring about change on a broader scale. That Moore focuses on actions as a way of achieving respectability draws attention to the fact that actions can be changed, learned, and mimicked, allowing for the individual to enter into previously restricted social and cultural areas.

Byron, likewise, relies on the performance of gentlemanly conduct to determine national identity, as the majority of his targets in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* are criticized for their inability to uphold such standards. This restrictive view of national identity as a matter of performance likely arises from Brougham's criticism of Byron's claim to Scottishness, which is at odds with his inability to correctly exhibit characteristics Scottish identity, as exemplified by his mis-identification of words and places. However, as Moore's argument demonstrates, the ability to mimic or copy such behavior ultimately undermines the exclusionary nature of such codes of conduct. While the satire initially upholds the standards of Augustan literature, Byron's poorly formed theory of identity only holds through the publication of *EBSR* and is ultimately proved wrong in subsequent works. Byron's satirist however, takes on the role of a national protector of literature, as the authors he critiques and the negative behaviors they display are representative of the corrupting influence of "foreign," non-English literature. Byron's style (traditional Juvenalian satire) and purpose (to preserve the status quo) serve as a counter-example to the forward-thinking satirist bard of Moore and Burns's satires; yet Byron's satirist still acts in such a way as to safeguard

what he sees as national identity, a more subtle, and somewhat more passive role, but one that still maintains elements of both bard and satirist.

While the lyric poetry of both Burns and Moore has long been acknowledged as nationalist, little attention has thus far been given to the use of satire. The potential for nationalist discourse in Byron's early works, on the other hand, has been largely overlooked due to the perceived immaturity and insincerity of *Hours of Idleness* and *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*. An examination of these lesser-studied works, however, opens several opportunities for new studies in the field of Romanticism, first by offering new perspectives on Burns, Moore, and Byron's own perception of their sense of national identity and attitudes toward nationalism that can be found throughout their careers. Additionally, satire in general, as Gary Dyer correctly observes, was not, in fact, a dead or dying genre in the Romantic era, but one that was alive and flourishing, albeit changing in significant ways. One way, as Dyer and Stauffer point out, is that satire adjusts to compensate for increased governmental censure of seditious writings, given the heightened political tension in what is essentially an age of revolution. The revolutionary spirit inspired by this ongoing climate of political unrest combines with an increased attention to antiquarianism and the desire to preserve national culture against the political and cultural structures of Anglicization.

As seen in these case studies, Burns, Moore, and Byron respond to this political and cultural tension by imbuing their satires with nationalist themes and rhetoric. This results in a narrator who is a combination of satirist and bard, a voice who is both a critic of government oppression and a preserver of traditional national culture. That this combined figure appears in various iterations across the works of all three poets, individuals arguably separated by age and nationality, is suggestive of a larger trend in Romantic era satire that has until now been overlooked, but bears examining as a uniquely Romantic characteristic of satire.

Ultimately, in nineteenth-century satire, the figure of the bard becomes intertwined with the persona of the satirist. It is this melding of roles that creates a forward-thinking satirist, one who speaks from the position of the disenfranchised bard to critique the ruling government's methods of oppression. The satirist accomplishes this goal through the reductive nature of satire, a tactic that counteracts the English tendency to oversimplify and dismiss the Scottish and Irish cultures as backward and primitive by subjecting the English to their own tactics. In this way, authors using these techniques simultaneously reveal the literary richness and depth of cultural tradition found in the Scottish and Irish societies and highlight what Trumpener argues is an "underdevelopment of Englishness" (15), an English identity only loosely defined as the center of Empire and the seat of power.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Burns, Robert. *The Canongate Burns*. Andrew Noble and Patrick Scott Hogg, Eds. Canongate Classics: Edinburgh, 2001.

--- --- "The Twa Herds: An Unco Mournfu' Tale." pp. 552-554.

--- --- "Holy Willie's Prayer." pp. 557-560.

--- --- "The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer." pp. 19-25.

--- --- "The Holy Fair." pp. 28-35.

--- --- "A Dream." pp. 56-59.

--- --- "Address to the Unco Guid." pp. 192-194.

Byron, George Gordon. *The Complete Poetical Works*, Vol. I. Jerome McGann Ed. Oxford University Press, 1980.

--- --- *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers.* pp. 227-264.

--- --- *Hours of Idleness*. pp. 31-181.

--- --- "To a Knot of Ungenerous Critics." pp. 19-22.

--- --- "To Those Ladies Who Have So Kindly Defended the Author from the Attacks of Unprovoked Malignity." pp. 17-19.

--- --- *Don Juan*. *The Complete Poetical Works*, Vol. V. Jeroeme McGann Ed. Oxford University Press, 1980.

Moore, Thomas. *British Satire: 1785-1840. Vol. 5*. *The Satires of Thomas Moore.* Jane Moore, Ed. Pickering and Chatto: London 2003.

--- --- *Corruption and Intolerance: Two Poems. With Notes, Addressed to an Englishman by an Irishman.* pp. 13-17.

--- --- *The Sceptic: A Philosophical Satire. By the Author of Corruption and Intolerance.* pp.18-45.

--- --- *Intercepted Letters; or, The Twopenny Post-Bag. To which are added, Trifles Reprinted. By Thomas Brown, the Younger.* pp. 76-105.

--- --- *Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence, Vol. I*. Lord John Russel, Ed. Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans: London, 1853.

--- --- "Preface." *The Poetical Works of Thomas Moore: A New Edition, from the Last London Edition*. Phillips, Sampson, and Company: Boston, 1856. pp.17-22.

Secondary Sources

Allan, David. *Making British Culture: English Readers and the Scottish Enlightenment, 1740-1830.* Routledge, 2008.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso: London, 2006.

Banks, Stephen. *A Polite Exchange of Bullets: The Duel and the English Gentleman, 1750-1850.* The Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2010.

Beatty, Bernard. "The Force of 'Celtic Memories' in Byron's Thought." *English Romanticism and the Celtic World.* Gerard Carruthers and Alan Rawes, eds. Cambridge University Press, 2003. pp. 103-116.

Broadie, Alexander. *The Cambridge Companion to the Scottish Enlightenment.* Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Brougham, Henry. "Review of Byron's *Hours of Idleness*." *Edinburgh Review.* Jan. 1808. Rept. *Romantic Bards and British Reviewers*. John O. Hayden, Ed. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, 1971.

Brown, Kevin. *The Pox: The life and near death of a very social disease.* Sutton Publishing: Gloucestershire, UK, 2006.

Brown, Stewart. "Religion in Scotland." *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain.* H. T. Dickinson, Ed. Blackwell Publishing: Malden, MA, 2002. pp. 260-270.

Budge, Gavin. *Romantic Empiricism.* Bucknell University Press, 2007.

Calder, Angus, editor. *Byron and Scotland: Radical or Dandy?* Edinburgh University Press, 1989.

--- --- "Introduction." pp. 1-7.

Campbell, Thomas. "The Exile of Erin." *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Rogers and Thomas Campbell.* Epes Sargent, Ed. Phillips, Sampson, and Company: Boston, 1859. pp. 187-189.

Caruthers, Gerard and Liam McIlvanney, Eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature.* Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Chantler, Ashley. "The Meaning of 'Scotch Fiddle' in Rochester's 'Tunbridge Wells.'" *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700.* Vol. 26, No. 2, Fall 2002. pp. 81-84.

Cheeke, Stephen. *Byron and Place*. Bristol University, 2003.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837.* Yale University Press: New Haven, 2009.

Crawford, Robert. *Robert Burns and Cultural Authority*. University of Iowa Press: Iowa City, 1997.

Curran, Stuart. *The Cambridge Companion to British Romanticism.* Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Davis, Leith. "Irish Bards and English Consumers: Thomas Moore's 'Irish Melodies' and the Colonized Nation." *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature*, 24:2, April 1993. pp. 7-25.

--- --- *Acts of Union: Scotland and the Literary Negotiation of the British Nation, 1707-1830.* Standford University Press, 1999.

--- --- *Music, Postcolonialism, and Gender: The construction of Irish national identity, 1724-1874.* University of Notre Dame, 2006.

Davis, Leith, and David Duncan and Janet Sorensen. *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism.* Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Dietz, Vivien. "The Politics of Whisky: Scottish Distillers, the Excise, and the Pittite State." *The Journal of British Studies*. Vol. 36. No 1. Jan 1997. pp. 35-69.

Donelan, Charles. *Romanticism and Male Fantasy in Byron's* Don Juan: *A Marketable Vice*. MacMillan Press, LTD: London, 2000.

Duff, David and Catherine Jones. *Scotland, Ireland, and the Romantic Aesthetic.* Bucknell University Press, 2007.

Dyer, Gary. *British Satire and the Politics of Style*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

--- --- "Intercepted Letters, Men of Information: Moore's Twopenny Post-Bag and Fudge Family in Paris." *The Satiric Eye: Forms of Satire in the Romantic Period*. Ed. Steven E. Jones. London: Palgrave, 2003. pp. 151–171.

Egan, Pierce. *Grose's Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue.* London: 1823.

Eisler, Benita. *Child of Passion, Fool of Fame*. Alfred Knopf: New York, 1999.

Eliot, T.S. "Byron." *On Poetry and Poets*. *F.S.G. Classics.* 1957. Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York, 2009.

Ferris, Ina. *The Romantic National Tale and the Question of Ireland.* Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Fraser, Flora. *The Unruly Queen: The Life of Queen Caroline*. Bloomsbury: London, 2004.

Gottlieb, Evan. *Feeling British: Sympathy and National Identity in Scottish and English Writing, 1707-1832.* Bucknell University Press: Lewisburg, 2007.

Graham, Peter. *Lord Byron*. Twayne Publishers: New York, 1998.

--- --- "Byron and Expatriate Nostalgia." *Studies in Romanticism*. Vol. 47, No. 1, *Byron's Scots and Byron's Scotland*. Spring 2008, pp. 75-90.

Gribben, Crawford. "Religion and Scottish Romanticism." *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Romanticism.* Murray Pittock, Ed. Edinburgh University Press, 2011. pp. 112-126.

Griffin, Dustin. *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. University Press of Kentucky, 1994.

Grimes, Kyle. "Verbal Jujitsu: William Hone and the Tactics of Satirical Conflict." *The Satiric Eye*. Steven E. Jones, ed. Palgrave, 2003. pp. 173-184.

Gross, Jonathan. "Flyting in the *Declaration of Independence* and *The Vision of Judgment*." *The Byron Journal*, 35.1. June 2007. pp. 41-51.

Guilhamet, Leon. "Pox and Malice: Some Representations of Venereal Disease in Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Satire." *The Secret Malady: Venereal Disease in Eighteenth-Century Britain and France*. Linda E. Merians, Ed. University Press of Kentucky: Lexington, 1996. pp. 196-212.

Hammond, Brean. "Byron." *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Romanticism*. Murray Pittock, ed. Edinburgh University Press, 2011. pp. 150-165.

Harvey, Karen. "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800." *Journal of British Studies*. Vol. 44, No. 2. April 2005. pp. 296-311.

Haywood, Ian. *Bloody Romanticism: Spectacular Violence and the Politics of Representation, 1776-1832.* Palgrave Studies in the Enlightenment, Romanticism, and the Cultures of Print. Palgrave, 2006.

Hunt, Leigh and John Hunt. "The Prince on St. Patricks Day." *The Examiner*, 22 March, 1812, Issue 221. *British Library Newspapers, Part I: 1800-1900.*

Irvine, Valerie. *The King's Wife: George IV and Mrs. Fitzherbert*. Hambledon and London: London, 2005.

Innes, C. L. *Woman and Nation in Irish Literature and Society, 1880-1935.* Harvester, Wheatsheaf: New York, 1993.

Jones, Catherine A. "'Our Partial Attachments': Tom Moore and 1798." *Eighteenth-Century Ireland.* Vol. 13. 1998. pp. 24-43.

Jones, Howard. *The Harp That Once: A Chronicle of the Life of Thomas Moore.* H. Holt and Company: New York, 1937.

Jones, Steven, E. *Satire and Romanticism*. St. Martin's Press, 2000.

--- --- Ed. *The Satiric Eye*. Palgrave, 2003.

--- --- "Nineteenth-century Satiric Poetry." *A Companion to Satire*. Blackwell Publishing, 2007. pp. 340-360.

Jordan, Hoover. *Bolt Upright: The Life of Thomas Moore*. 2 Vols. Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg: Salsburg, Austria, 1975.

Kelly, Linda. *Ireland's Minstrel: A life of Tom Moore: Poet, Patriot, and Byron's Friend.* I.B. Tauris: London, 2006.

Kiberd, Declan. *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation*. Johnathan Cape: London, 1995.

Kidd, Colin. *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-1830.* Cambridge University Press, 1993.

--- --- *British Identities Before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800.* Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Kress, Simon B. "The Music of the Sentimental Nationalist Heart: Thomas Moore and Seamus Heaney." *New Hibernia Review*. Vol. 15. No. 1. Spring 2011, pp. 123-137.

Kuchta, David. *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity, 1550-1850.* University of California Press: Berkeley, 2002.

Lenihan, Padraig. *Consolidating Conquest: Ireland, 1603-1727.* Routledge: London, 2008.

Leask, Nigel. "Robert Burns and Romanticism in Britain and Ireland." *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Romanticism.* Murray Pittock, Ed. Edinburgh University Press, 2011. pp. 127-138.

--- --- "Robert Burns." *The Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature.* Caruthers, Gerard and Liam McIlvanney, Eds. Cambridge University Press, 2012. pp. 71-85.

Leyburn, James G. *The Scotch-Irish: A Social History*. University of North Carolina Press: 1962.

Lockwood, Thomas. *Post-Augustan Satire: Charles Churchill and Satirical Poetry*. University of Washington, 1979.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. "'Nature' as Aesthetic Norm." *Modern Language Notes*. Vol. 42, No. 7, Nov. 1927, pp. 444-450.

MacCarthy, Fiona. *Byron: Life and Legend.* Farrar, Straus, and Girox: New York, 2002.

MacKinnon, Charles. *Scottish Highlanders*. Barnes and Noble: New York, 1992.

Macro. *The Scotiad, or Wise Men of the North!!!* J.J. Stockdale: London, 1809.

Marchand, Leslie A. *Byron: A Biography*. 3 vols. Alfred A Knopf: New York, 1957.

Mayer, Tamar. *Gender Ironies of Nationalism: Sexing the nation.* Routledge: London, 2000.

McCulloch, Margery. "The Provost and his Lord: John Galt and Lord Byron." Calder, pp. 65-85.

McGinty, J. Walter. *Robert Burns and Religion*. Ashgate Publishing: Aldershot, England, 2003.

McGuirk, Carol. *Robert Burns and the Sentimental Era*. The University of Georgia Press: Athens, 1985.

McIntyre, Ian. *Robert Burns: A Life*. Welcome Rain Publishers: New York, 2001.

McNeil, Kenneth. *Scotland, Britain, Empire: Writing the Highlands, 1760-1860.* Ohio State University, 2007.

Medwin, Thomas. *Journal of the Conversations of Lord Byron: Noted During a Residence with His Lordship at Pisa*. Henry Colburn: London, 1824.

Merians, Linda. "Introduction." *The Secret Malady: Venereal Disease in Eighteenth-Century Britain and France*. Linda E. Merians, Ed. University Press of Kentucky: Lexington, 1996. Pp. 1-12.

Moody, Jane. "Thomas Brown [alias Thomas Moore], Censorship and Regency Cryptography." *European Romantic Review*. Vol. 18, No. 2. April 2007. pp. 187-194.

Noble, Andrew. "Byron: Radical, Scottish Aristocrat." Calder, pp. 23-43.

Noble, Andrew and Patrick Scott Hogg, Eds. *The Canongate Burns*. Canongate Classics: Edinburgh, 2001.

Nolan, Emer. *Catholic Emancipations: Irish Fiction from Thomas Moore to James Joyce*. Syracuse University Press: Syracuse, NY, 2007.

Packenham, Thomas. *The Year of Liberty: The story of the great Irish Rebellion of 1798.* Prentice-Hall, Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1969.

Parks, Ward. "Flyting, Sounding, Debate: Three Verbal Contest Genres." *Poetics Today.* Vol. 7, No. 3. *Poetics of Fiction* 1986. pp. 439-458.

Pittock, Murray. *Inventing and Resisting Britain: Cultural Identities in Britain and Ireland, 1685-1789.* Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.

-- -- *Celtic Identity and the British Image*. Manchester University Press, 1999.

-- -- *Scottish and Irish Romanticism.* Oxford University Press, 2008.

-- -- "Enlightenment, Romanticism, and the Scottish Canon: Cosmopolites or Narrow Nationalists?" *Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature.* Cambridge University Press, 2012. pp. 86-102.

Quinn, Justin. *The Cambridge Introduction to Modern Irish Poetry, 1800-2000.* Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Quintero, Ruben. *A Companion to Satire*. Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Radcliffe, David. "Re: Research Question." Received by Shannon Heath, 15 June, 2015.

Rawes, Alan. "Lord Byron." *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature, Vol. 2: Enlightenment, Britain, and Empire (1707-1918)*. Ian Brown, Ed. Edinburgh University Press, 2007. pp. 178-182.

Rawson, Claude. *Satire and Sentiment.* Cambridge University Press, 1994

Rutherford, Andrew. *Byron: Augustan and Romantic*. London: McMillan, 1990.

Scrivener, Michael. "Inside and Outside Romanticism." *Criticism*. 46.1 (2004) pp. 151-165.

Shelburne, Steven. "The Epistolary Ethos of Formal Satire." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language.* 36:2, Formal Considerations. University of Texas Press: Summer, 1994. pp. 135-165.

Shields, Juliet. *Sentimental Literature and Anglo-Scottish Identity.* Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Sher, Richard B. *The Enlightenment and the Book*. University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Shoemaker, Robert B. "The Taming of the Duel: Masculinity, Honor, and Ritual Violence, 166-1800." *The Historical Journal*. Vol. 45, No. 3, Sept. 2002. Pp. 525-545.

Smith, E. A. *George IV*. Yale University Press: 1999.

Speer, Roderick. "Byron and the Scottish Literary Tradition." *Studies in Scottish Literature*. Vol. 14, No. 1, Jan. 1979. pp. 196-206.

Spongberg, Mary. *Feminizing Venereal Disease: The body of the prostitute in nineteenth-century medical discourse.* MacMillan Press, LTD: London 1997.

State, Paul F. *A Brief History of Ireland*. Checkmark Books: New York, 2009.

Stauffer, Andrew. *Anger, Revolution, and Romanticism*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Steier, Michael P. "Transgressing the Borders of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers.*" *Studies in Romanticism*. Vol. 47, No. 1, *Byron's Scots and Byron's Scotland*. Spring 2008, pp. 37-52.

Stewart, Graham and Inge Russell and Anne Anstruther. "An Introduction to Whisk(e)y and the development of Scotch Whisky." *Whisky: Technology, Production, and Marketing*. 2nd ed. Inge Russel and Graham Stewart, Eds. International Centre for Brewing and Distilling (ICBD): Heriot-Watt University, UK, 2014. pp. 1-6.

Strachan, John. "Poetry of the Anti-Jacobin." *A Companion to Romanticism*. Duncan Wu, Ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd. 1999.

Strong, L.A.G. *The Minstrel Boy: A portrait of Thomas Moore*. Alfred A. Knopf: New York 1937.

Test, George A. *Satire: Spirit and Art*. University of South Florida Press, 1991.

Thomas, Donald. "Leigh Hunt and the Prince on St. Patrick's Day." *The Library*. Vol. s6-III, No. 2, Jan. 1981: pp. 145-149.

Thuente, Mary Helen. *The Harp Re-Strung: The United Irishmen and the Rise of Irish Literary Nationalism*. Syracuse University Press, 1994.

Tomko, Michael. *British Romanticism and the Catholic Question: Religion, history and national identity, 1778-1829.* Palgrave MacMillan: New York, 2011.

Tonra, Justin. "Masks of Refinement: Pseudonym, Paratext, and Authorship in the Early Poetry of Thomas Moore." *European Romantic Review*, Vol. 25, No. 5., 2014. pp. 551-573.

Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire.* Princeton University Press, 1997.

Vance, Norman. *Irish Literature Since 1800.* Pearson Education: London, 2002.

Watson, Alex. "Byron's Marginalia to *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*." *The Byron Journal*. Vol. 37, No 2, 2009: pp. 131-140.

Webb, Keith. *The Growth of Nationalism in Scotland*. Molendinar Press: Glasgow, 1977.

de Verre White, Terence. *Tom Moore: The Irish Poet*. Hamish Hamilton: London, 1977.

Wright, Julia. *Ireland, India, and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Literature*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Vita

Shannon Heath was born December 20, 1981 in Bluefield, West Virginia. She graduated from Mount View High School in 2000, and completed her Bachelor of Arts degree in 2005 at Concord University. She received her Master of Arts degree from Virginia Tech in 2007, with a concentration in British Literature. She returned to Concord University as an instructor in the Spring of 2008, and then enrolled into the Doctoral program at the University of Tennessee in 2009. She specializes in British Romantic Literature, poetry, and satire, as well as subsidiary interests in the Greek War of Independence and Greek culture. Additional interests include the leisure study of comics and graphic novels, and toying with various foreign languages.